MOTIVES
OF
CONVERSION
TO THE
CATHOLICK FAITH,
As it is PROFESSED
IN THE
REFORMED CHURCH
OF
ENGLAND.

By *Neal Carolan*, formerly Parish-Prieſt of *Slane* and *Stacallan*, &c. in *Meath*.

Imprimatur,
Aug. 8. 1688. *Rad. Rule, R. R. in Chriſto Patri, ac Domino Domino Franciſco Archiep. Dublin. à ſacr. domeſt.*

DUBLIN,
Printed by *Joſ. Ray*, for *William Norman* in *Dames-ſtreet*, and *Eliphal Dobſon* at the *Stationers Arms* in *Caſtle ſtreet*. 1688.

The Preface to the Reader.

It is just and reasonable that every man that deserts the Communion of a Church in which he hath been educated, and embraceth a Communion distinct from it, should render some accompt to the world of the reasons of his change, that so he might avoid the imputation of levity and rashness. This hath been done by many of the Protestants that have embraced the Roman Faith; namely, by Dr. Vane, Mr. Cressy, Mr. Manby, *and others, and by many Romanists, that have embraced the Reformed Religion, by the Learned Archbishop of* Spalato, *and several others, and being my self resolved to forsake the Communion of the Church of* Rome, *and to embrace that of the Reformed Church of* Ireland, *which I think more agreeable to the Word of God, and to the Primitive Antiquity, I look on my self to be under the same obligations of satisfying others, in the Motives of my change.*

As it was my great happiness to be Baptized into the Christian Faith, so it was my misfortune to be educated in that which is far distant from it (I mean the Roman Faith) as it now stands since the determinations of the Council of Trent: *and I hope the Gentlemen of that Religion will not take it ill that I call it an infelicity, since I can entertain no other apprehensions of it, whilst I lie under the convictions that are at present upon my Spirit.*

In the Communion of this Church I was admitted into the seven Holy Orders of the Church in a weeks time, by Anthony Geoghegan, *Bishop of* Meath *in the Year* 1662, *and in the month of* August *in the same Year I was sent to* Paris, *where I was instructed in Philosophy in the College of* Graffini, *and took the Degree of Master in Arts, in the University of* Paris *aforesaid, and after Writing my Speculative Divinity in the College of* Navar *in the said University, under* Dr. Vinot, Dr. Saussay, *and* Dr. Ligny. *I finished my course, and took up a resolution of returning to my Native Country, where I landed about* June 1667, *and afterwards continued about some two years teaching a private School in the Borders of* Meath; *till in the year* 1669, *I was instituted into the Parish of* Slane, *and* Stacallan, *by* Oliver Desle, *then Vicar General of the Diocess of* Meath, *where I continued as Parish Priest for four intire years, to the no small content and satisfaction of my Parishioners: from them in the year* 1675, *I was removed to the Parishes of* Painstown, *and* Brownstown, *and in the year* 79. *commanded back again to my first charge in* Slane.

During this time, I had the opportunity of reading two Bookes, that were most especially recommended to the Clergy of the Province of Ulster, *by the late Primate* Oliver Plunket, *viz.* Archdekins Theologia Tripartita, *and the Touchstone of the Reformed Gospel. The former of these he distributed amongst us, at a certain price, when the first impression of it came forth, and the latter we were*

required

required to purchaſe, as being very proper to confute Proteſtants out of their own Bibles. I was no leſs forward in procuring the Book, then induſtrious in reading them, and for a long time I thought them unanſwerable, till at length diſcourſing with ſome of the Reverend Proteſtant Clergy of Meath, I found by them that the Touchſtone, was only an old Book new vampt up with a new Title, and ſome few Chapters added, and that it had been long ago publiſhed, under the Title of the Gag for the new Goſpel, and learnedly been anſwered by the Reverend Biſhop Mountague. Whereupon I procured the anſwer to it, and upon peruſal found that the Author of the Old Gag ro New Touchſtone (call it which you pleaſe) had in many things baſely miſrepreſented the Doctrine of the Proteſtants, propounding it in ſuch crude, and indifinite terms as no ſober Proteſtant doth acknowledge it for their ſenſe: as in his 2d, Propoſition he affirms, that Proteſtants ſay that in matters of Faith, We muſt not relye upon the judgment of the Church, and of her Paſtors, but only on the written word. In the 3d, that the Scriptures are eaſily to be underſtood. In the 4th, that Apoſtolical Traditions, and ancient cuſtoms of the Church (not found in the written word) are not to to be received, nor oblige. In the 5th, that a man by his own underſtanding, or private Spirit, may rightly judge and interpret Scripture. In the 7th, that the Church can erre. In the 32, that the Saints may not pray for us, and ſo in others. None of which Propoſitionsare owned by Proteſtants, as their Doctrines without many previous diſtinctions and limitations. I found alſo that in other things he had hudled together many Propoſitions as the general ſenſe of Proteſtants, which (if he had conſulted their learned Writings) he would have found to be no more then School Points, and Problematical Queſtions; nay, which are ſtill diſputed as ſuch by the beſt learned men in the Church of Rome. Such are for Example, The Doctrines of Freewill, in the 19th Propoſition, The Impoſſibility of keeping the Commandements, in the 20th Propoſition, The Inamiſſibility of Faith, in the 23th, The Doctrine of Election, and Reprobation, in the 24th, The Doctrine of Aſſurance of Salvation. in the 25th and The Doctrine of every man having his Guardian Angel, in the 26th, moſt of which Points are matter of Controverſie between Remonſtrants, and Contra-remonſtrants amongſt the Proteſtants, And between the Janſeniſts and Jeſuits in the Church of Rome.

This unfair proceeding, charging the Proteſtants with Doctrines, which they either totally deny, or do not acknowledge without previous diſtinctions, bred a diſtike in me to the Book, and conſequently put me upon an inquiry into thoſe Doctrines of the Proteſtants which the Author of it had ſo fouly miſrepreſented, and the more I read in their Writings the better I was reconciled to their Opinions, and the worſe I liked thoſe of the Church of Rome; ſome of whoſe Errors I ſhall briefly touch, as the Motives of my Converſion, and occaſion of my deſerting her Communion.

Motives

Motives of Converſion to the Catholick Faith, as it is profeſſed in the Reformed Church of England.

CHAP. I.

Of the Uncharitableneſs of the Church of Rome.

THE firſt Motive thereof is her great Uncharitableneſs, not only to Proteſtants, but alſo to all other Societies of Chriſtians this day in the World except themſelves; and that in two things.

Firſt, In confining the Catholick Church to themſelves.

Secondly, In excluding all others from hope of Salvation that are not in their own Communion.

It will be unneceſſary to prove that theſe are the Doctrines of the Church of *Rome*, ſince there is no Controvertiſt that doth not affirm them, and they are expreſly defined in the Council of *Trent*, in her *Anathema* to every Article. And Pope *Pius* IV. affirms in his Bull, *That this is the Catholick Faith, out of which no one can be ſaved.* All the Clergy of *Ireland*, whether Secular or Regular, are taught to ſay ſo; the Prieſts and Friers affirm it in their Sermons now to the People more than ever: And it is one of the moſt popular Arguments and common Topicks of Converſion that they all uſe to the Proteſtants, to reconcile them to the Church of *Rome*: That they are all Hereticks; That they are out of the Church; That there is no hopes of Salvation for them whileſt they are ſo.

The firſt of theſe particulars, *viz.* Confining of the Catholick Church to themſelves, is a Propoſition ſo hugely unreaſonable that I could hardly bring my ſelf to the belief of it. It ſeemed

to me a very unreaſonable thing, that the Church of *Rome*, which is but a Member of the Catholick Church (and that none of the ſoundeſt) ſhould arrogate to it ſelf the Name and Priviledges of the whole Catholick. *Quia à dicto ſecundùm quid, ad dictum ſimpliciter non valet conſequentia; Nec ſemper denominatio totius ſequitur partes ſeperatim ſumptas.* And I could find no Text of Scripture for the juſtification of it, nor any ſound Reaſon to prove it, nor any promiſe of our Saviour on which to ground it; and I concluded with my ſelf, that the affirming it might prove a dangerous prejudice to the perpetuity of the Church, and contradict our Saviours promiſe concerning the Gates of Hell not being able to prevail againſt it, becauſe it was not only poſſible that the Church of *Rome*, as well as other Churches, might err, but there are expreſs Cautions given her in that particular by St. *Paul*, Rom 11. 18, 20. *Thou beareſt not the root, but the root thee: Be not high minded but fear, and if God ſpareth not the natural branches, take heed leaſt he alſo ſpare not thee.* In the Writings of the Primitive Fathers it appears, that they never believed the Church of *Rome* to be any thing elſe but a particular Church. *Ignatius*, in the Title of his Epiſtle to the *Romans*, ſtiles it Ἡ προκαθηται ἐν τοπῳ χωριου ῥωμαιων. And St. *Ambroſe* reckons the *Roman* Church in the ſame rank with the Churches of *Egypt* and *Alexandria*: So that if they were particular, or topical Churches, the Church of *Rome* muſt be ſo too. The ſame thing doth Pope * *Celeſtine* in his Epiſtle to *John* Biſhop of *Antioch*, where he reckons up the Churches of *Rome* and *Alexandria* as Members of the Catholick Church. *Aſſeret ſe* (Neſtorius) *fidem tenere, quam ſecundum Apoſtolicam doctrinam Romana, Alexandrina, & Catholica univerſalis Eccleſia tenet.* Nay it appears by the Epiſtle of Pope *Innocent* III. to *John*, Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, that in the 12*th* Century the Pope himſelf did not believe it. *Dicitur autem univerſalis Eccleſia, quæ de univerſis conſtet Eccleſiis, quæ Græco Verbo Catholica nominatur:* (ſays he) *Eccleſia Romana ſic non eſt univerſalis Eccleſia, ſed univerſalis Eccleſiæ pars.*

* *Apud Binium in Concil. Epheſino.*

Lib. 2. Epiſt. 200.

Beſides

Besides this, I find this very Proposition condemned in the *Donatists*, and looked upon by the Fathers as the grand Fundamental Principle of their Schism and Division; for they, as appears by the Writings of St. *Augustine* and *Optatus*, did affirm that Christ had no Church on Earth, but in the parts of *Donatus*: that the Church was perished in all parts of the World except their own Assemblies, and that Salvation no where could be had but in their Communion; they esteemed the rest of the Christians to be no better than Pagans: they broke their Chalices, scraped their Altars, and washed their Vestments, and the Walls of their Churches, pretending that all was polluted by their touch of them. How much of this Spirit doth reign in our modern Donatists is easily observed by any man that will take the pains to compare their Writings and Practises with those of their Ancestors, the antient Donatists in *Africk*. And indeed it is high time for every man to leave the society of that Person that thinks himself alone to have reason, and all the rest of mankind to be mad and out of their wits.

Nor is this Proposition only unreasonable, but is also very uncharitable, in as much as it condemns not only Protestant Churches, but all the Christians in the Eastern parts of the World that are not of the *Roman* Faith; the *Greeks* and *Armenians*, the *Jacobites* and *Nestorians*, the *Maronites* and *Abissines*, and *Cophtites* or *Christians of Egypt*, and for ever excludes them from hopes of Salvation; which is in effect to unchurch the greatest part of Christians, and condemn them to everlasting burnings; who are more in number, and more extend in Territories then the Professors of the present *Roman* Faith can pretend to be; notwithstanding all their brags of Universality. It may be perhaps said, that the Eastern Christians and Protestants are Hereticks: but I think it much easier to say so than make it good; and if they were, yet the charity of the modern *Romanists* is much more streightned than that of St. *Augustines* was, who durst not deny a possibility of Salvation, even to Hereticks themselves. For when the *Donatists* did object, that Heresie is an Harlot, that if Baptism of Hereticks be good,

De Baptis. contra Don. l. 1. c. 10. l. 5. c. 27.

good, then Sons are born to God of Hereſie; and ſo of an Harlot. His Anſwer was, that the Conventicles of Hereticks do bear Children unto God; not in that wherein they are divided, but in that wherein they ſtill remain join'd with the True & Catholick Church; not in that they are Hereticks, but as much as they profeſs and practiſe that which other Chriſtians do. Nay, according to the Opinion of the *Roman* Doctors they have no reaſon (if they ſtand to their own Principles) to judg ſo ſeverely of Hereticks; for they grant that the honour of Martyrdom is only peculiar to the Members of the Catholick Church; and they cannot deny but it is poſſible for an Heritick to ſuffer for the Chriſtian Religion, and lay down his life in the defence of the Faith of Chriſt: From whence it muſt inevitably follow, according to their own confeſſions, that either Hereticks may be ſaved, or elſe Martyrdom is not proper to the Church and Members of it.

Nor are the Romaniſts only unreaſonable, and uncharitable, in confining the Catholick Church to themſelves, but they are ſo in excluding alſo other Chriſtians from the hopes of Salvation that are not of their own Communion. This will appear from two Conſiderations. First, they are more uncharitable to them then they are to Heathens that never heard of Jeſus Chriſt: for *many of their own Writers do grant a poſſibility of Salvation to the Pagans, if they live good moral lives, and yet the Proteſtants, thô they believe in Chriſt, and profeſs all the Articles of the Apoſtles Creed, and lead their lives ſuitable to the Goſpel, muſt be damned to Hell; only becauſe they cannot believe the Church of *Rome* to be their Miſtreſs, nor call the Pope their Maſter on Earth.

* Lud. Vives in Aug. de Civitat Dei. l. 18. c. 47. Andr. id. l. 3. At alii apud Caſail. de quadripli juſtit. l. 1. c. 12 & Collium de anim. pag. l. 1. c. 24. & l. 5. c. 7, 8, 22.

It ſeems that Infidelity is a leſſer crime then Non-Communion with *Rome*; that there is more hopes of *Pagans*, then of *Proteſtants*, to be ſaved, and that it is more pardonable not to believe in Chriſt Jeſus then to deny the authority of the Church of *Rome*: In that many of them make ſo few things to be neceſſary to be believed in order to eternal ſalvation, that upon their own Principles they cannot exclude the Proteſtants from the

hopes

hopes of it; and for thoſe that inlarge the Articles of Belief a little farther, they cannot deny Salvation to the Proteſtants, if they believe all that they require as neceſſary.

Some men make the Belief of Jeſus Chriſt, and ſubmiſſion to his Laws, ſufficient to bring a man to Heaven; and if ſo, it is very uncharitable to exclude Proteſtants from it, that believe ſo much, as well as themſelves. Others add the knowledge and belief of thoſe things that are contained in the Lords Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, and Doctrin of the Sacraments. Now take the explicite *credenda*, in which of theſe Notions you will, it is hugely uncharitable, to exclude the Proteſtants out of Heaven, when they believe Jeſus Chriſt to be the Son of God, and ſubmit to his Laws, and live according to his Religion; when they believe all that is contained in the Creed, the Lords Prayer, and the Decalogue, and aſſent to the Doctrin of thoſe Sacraments that are generally neceſſary for ſalvation.

CHAP. II.

Of the Infallibility of the Pope.

THE ſecond Motive is, The Doctrine of the *Roman* Church concerning the Infallibility of the Pope; alſo concerning an Infallible Church and General Council, and concerning the Infallible Judg or Guide in Controverſies about Religion, which the *Romaniſts* talk ſo much of, and pretend to have.

No man certainly that fully conſiders the various models of an Infallible Guide which the ſeveral parties of Papiſts do deſcribe and defend in oppoſition to one another, will wonder that I have given this Chapter a manifold Title. The great uncertainty and confuſion of Opinions which I found in the Romiſh Communion about this affair was not the leaſt cauſe of my being diſcontented with that Religion: It ſtartled me exceedingly at the beginning of my inquiry, to find the main Pillar of the Romiſh Doctrin (that is the Infallible Director above mentioned)

was

was only a name without any reality, for there is little or nothing ſet up by one party under this name or title which is not ſtrongly confuted by another of the Roman Catholicks; yet they all join to run down the Proteſtants for having a Religion built upon no ſecure foundation; for all Religion is ſo inſecurely built (if we believe the Romaniſts) which is not bottomed upon the Teſtimony of ſome viſible Infallible director; whether that be the unerring guidance or direction of the Pope, as ſome think, or of a Pope and General Council together, as others do judg; or of a Council without the Pope, and acting under an aſſumed Preſident, as a third ſort imagine. Now it is true indeed, that our Faith, ought to rely upon an Infallible Foundation, and the written Word of God is the thing, and the vain pretence of a viſible unerring Judge, or Guide; is nothing but mere conceit, as I ſhall hereafter plainly ſhew.

Therefore I look upon my ſelf at preſent as obliged to acquaint the Reader, how much I found my ſelf miſtaken concerning this Infallible Guide, which heretofore I very much relied upon. When I entered into an enquiry, and would very gladly have conſulted him, and take his advice, immediately I found my ſelf loſt in an endleſs wilderneſs of Diſputes, diſſentions, and inconſiſtent Opinions concerning him: For the writers of the *Roman* Church are divided into ſeveral Sects about this affair, and what one party of them ſets up, another party pulls down and rejects.

Moſt Divines that have dependance on the Court of *Rome*, and likewiſe many others, maintain that the Pope is Infallible in his own Perſon; and that he needs not the concurrence of general Councils, but can make Infallible Decrees concerning Faith and Manners, by himſelf alone: yet they are not well agreed about this neither.

Albertus Pighius (as it is reported by *Cardinal Bell. lib. 4. c. 2, de Rom. Pont.*) was of opinion, that the Pope could not become a Hereticke, neither in his private capacity, nor when he acted publickly by his Pontifical Authority. Now the Cardinal, thô a great Aſſertor of Papal Priviledges, yet condemns this

this Opinion of *Pighius* for an extravagance. Thus

'The third Opinion (*for he had cited two before*) is in the 'other extream, that the Pope 'in no way can become an He-'retick, nor publickly teach 'Hereſie, although he defines 'ſome things by himſelf alone.

Tertia ſententia eſt in altero extremo Pontificem non poſſe ullo modo eſſe Hæreticum, nec docere publicè Hæreſin, etiamſi rem aliquam ſolus definiat. Ita Albertus Pighius, lib. 4. c. 8. Hierarch. Eccl.

Nevertheleſs not only this Cardinal, but alſo *Cajetan*, and *Baronius*, moſt of the order of the Jeſuites, and in ſhort, all the Divines of the *Italian* Faction, do ſtifly maintain the perſonal Infallibility of the Pope: In ſome ſenſe indeed more moderatly, and in ſome ſenſe more extravagantly, then *Pighius*; for they are more moderate in acknowledging that the Pope in his private capacity may become a Heretick, and much worſe. Yet they conſtantly affirm, that in his publick capacity, and when he makes uſe of his Pontifical Authority, then he cannot poſſibly be in the wrong, nor teach any falſe Doctrin. And this Poſition they endeavor to make good, by the beſt Arguments they can get: Every little ſhadow of proof, that occurrs either in the holy Scripture, or in the Fathers, is fetched out in order to confirm this pretended unerring priviledg of the *Roman* Prelate. Amongſt other things the Example of the Jewiſh high Prieſt is thought to have ſome weight in it, thô ſome of thoſe were Idolaters; and one, that is *Caiphas*, by the ſame ſentence condemned Chriſt for a Deceiver, and the whole Chriſtian Religion for an Impoſture. Now the *Romiſh* Doctors being urged with this mighty Scandal, and ſhame to Pontifical Infallibility, do (ſome of them) give this anſwer; that *Caiphas* miſtook the matter of Fact, but not the matter of Faith. See *Bell. Tom. 2. lib. 2. c. 8. Concil. de Authoritate Rom. Pont.*

And the wiſe Author of the *Papiſt Miſrepreſented*, pag. 46. brings this Example of *Caiphas* upon the ſtage, not conſidering that it is ſo far from being any way advantagious to the pretence of the *Roman Pontiff*, that it even diſgraces the very name of High Prieſt. This Author, *c. 18. pag.* 46. ſpeaking of the Grace

and

and Aſſiſtance which God in ſome inſtances gave to Perſons eminent in Office; and particularly to *Caiphas*, when he judged it neceſſary that Chriſt ſhould be put to death for the conſervation of the Nations: he ſays, 'With like helping Grace, he doubts not 'but God generally aſſiſts the Paſtors of the New Law, and more 'eſpecially the High Prieſt (that is the Pope) for the good of the 'whole Flock. And therefore thô he were as wicked as *Caiphas*, 'yet he is ready to render him all reſpect due to his Function, and 'to obey him in every thing concerning the exerciſe of his Charge, 'not for any conſideration of his Perſon, but meerly for the Office 'he bears. Let the Reader obſerve the words of this Author; what a notable guide the Biſhop of *Rome* is according to this mans deſcription of him; His extraordinary endowments in conducting Souls to Heaven is compared unto the Grace which *Caiphas* had when he falſly and unjuſtly condemned our Saviour for a Deceiver; and conſequently the whole Chriſtian Religion for a deceit. Nothing certainly can be more ſtrange, unleſs it be what Cardinal *Bellarmine* ſays concerning Papal Infallibilty, *lib.* 4. *de Rom. Pont. c.* 5. he maintains that the Pope hath a priviledge of being free from error, in making any publick Decree what ever relating to Faith or Practiſe; and he carrys the Aſſertion ſo high as to ſay, that 'If the 'Pope ſhould err by command 'ing Vices, and forbidding Ver- 'tues, the Church would be 'bound to believe, that Vices 'were good, and Vertues evil; 'unleſs it would ſin againſt 'Conſcience. Wonderful Doctrine.

Si Papa erraret præcipiendo vitia, vel prohibendo virtutes, teneretur Eccleſia credere vitia eſſe bona, & virtutes malas, niſi vellet contra conſcientiam peccare. Lib. 4. *de Rom. Pont. Cap.* 5.

Certainly no man of any reaſon or honeſty but will abhor ſuch a Poſition; and accordingly *Bellarmines* heart ſmote him in his old age for having delivered ſuch a thing: And therefore in his Recognition upon this paſſage he minced the matter, and partly recalled this wild ſaying, perhaps when he was near death, and had no hopes to obtain the Papacy for himſelf; then he was content

tent to ſpeak more ſoberly concerning the Power and Priviledges of the Pope.

But above all men commend me to *Coſterus* the Jeſuite, for a wonderful Teacher of Papal Infallibility. He ſays, 'It may 'come to paſs, as we confeſs, 'that the Succeſſor of St. *Peter* 'may worſhip Idols, privately 'perhaps, having a wrong Opi- 'nion concerning the Faith, and 'may conſequently be a Studier 'of Diabolical Arts. But this 'we conſtantly deny, that the 'Popes of *Rome*, Vicars of 'Chriſt, and Succeſſors of St. 'Peter, can teach Hereſie to 'others, or propoſe an Error.

Fatemur fieri poſſe, ut Petri *Succeſſor Idola colat, apud ſe forte de Fide non recte ſentiens; adeoque Artibus Diabolicis operam navet. Sed conſtanter negamus Vicarios Chriſti, Petrique Succeſſores, Romanos Pontifices, vel alios docere poſſe, vel Errorem proponere. Coſt. Enchirid.*

Whether *Coſterus*, when he delivered this, had an eye to thoſe Popes, who have been accuſed of being Magicians, and invoking Devils, I cannot determin. But I appeal to all perſons endu'd with Reaſon, and let them judge whether I had not juſt cauſe to grow very much diſſatisfied with that Communion, whoſe Members do firſt make it neceſſary for all Chriſtians to bottom and ground their Faith and Religion upon the credit of an Infallible Guide, and then they give the moſt lewd deſcription of him that ever was heard. One that may be an Idolater, a Wizard and an Infidel, an Heretick in his private capacity, one that is notwithſtanding to be obeyed, if he command Vices, and forbid Vertues; and if he command ſo, all Chriſtians are bound to believe Vices to be good, and Vertues evil: one that is an Infallible Guide, ſuch as *Caiphas* was: one that has as much ſecurity and certainty of being in the right as *Caiphas* had. Whence it follows, that the Chriſtians, who rely on the Pope, have juſt as much certainty of being in the right, as the *Jews* in our Saviours time had of being ſo, by relying on their High Prieſt; yet they, notwithſtanding the infallible Conduct of *Caiphas*, cryed againſt Chriſt, *Crucifie him, crucifie him*, and releaſe

unto us Barabbas. Doubtleſs theſe men, who deſcribe and prove the Popes Infallibility after ſuch a manner, as you have heard, are very blamable. Methinks they ſhould have more regard to the Honour of a Prince, than to have characterized him as they do. I know it was not done out of any ill will, but it is uſual for too officious Servants ſometimes to do their Maſters as much hurt, as if they were real Enemies.

Thus the Reader will fully perceive how little ſatisfaction I found in the pretended unerring Guide, or Conductor, which the Italian Papiſts do propoſe. It is manifeſt there is very little comfort or ſecurity in the Conduct of ſuch a Guide. But being diſappointed in expecting infallible Guidance from any one perſon, ſuch as the Pope is, whom the Italian Parafites advance; I proceeded to conſider another unerrable Guide, which the French Divines ſet up in oppoſition to the Italians, that is, a General Council. This indeed at firſt appeared unto me to have the faireſt pretenſion to be the Guide ſo much talked of. I ſuppoſe it well known, that in *France* the Perſonal Infallibility is generally rejected and deeryed, as an untrue and groundleſs thing; and many large Diſcourſes have been written by the French Divines, in order to prove not only that the Pope may be deceived, but alſo that he has been very often actually ſo, even in matters of the greateſt importance. The Diſcourſes written by *Getſon* above 250 years ago are abundantly known to all men of Reading. And in later times *Launoius*, a *Sorbon* Doctor, in many places of his Epiſtles, not only declares his own Senſe againſt the Perſonal Infallibility of the Pope, but likewiſe the Senſe or Judgment of the Gallican Church. He reproaches one *Baro*, his adverſary, for holding the Biſhop of *Rome* to be incapable of erring, and counts *Baro* to be a Traytor to the Gallican Church and Nation for it. I ſhall produce one paſſage out of *Launoius* to this purpoſe.

Tract. An liceat in cauſis Fidei à ſummo Pontifice appellare.

Thus he inveighs againſt *Baro*, 'He perniciouſly deſtroys the Church of *France*,

In Gallicanam graſſatur Eccleſiam, quæ Romanum Pontifi-cem Submittit Concilio, & ei

'which

'which makes the Biſhop of *Rome* inferiour to a Council, 'and decrees againſt his Privi-'ledge of not erring in Faith 'and Manners, and contrariwiſe 'adjudges it only to the Church 'and to a Council, the Repre-'ſentative thereof.

non errandi in fide, & moribus privilegium abjudicat ſed ſoli adjudicat Eccleſia, & Eccleſiam figuranti Concilio. Launoius Epiſtolarum parte 5ta. Epiſtola ad Fortinum, pag. 43. vide etiam pag. 93.

Here we have ſeen this learned *Sorbon* Doctor directly oppoſite to the Italian Divines concerning this affair, which is under debate. It is likewiſe very well known, that *Richerius*, another Doctor of *Sorbon*, and as good a Roman Catholick as the beſt of them, has written his Hiſtory of General Councils on ſet purpoſe therein to run down and demoliſh the Perſonal Infallibility, and other pretended Priviledges of the Pope. But above all *Monſieur Maimbourg* (a moſt inveterate Enemy to the Proteſtant Religion) has compoſed a Book deſignedly to confute the vain pretence of Papal Infallibility: and in the ſixth Chapter of that Book abovementioned he alledges all manner of Authorities, in order to convince mankind, that the Pope is not infallible; and he clearly makes out his Allegations in 10 Chapters of the Book aforeſaid, concerning the Prerogatives of *Rome* and her Biſhop. That which is very pleaſant is, that *Maimbourg* finds ſeveral Popes, who thought their Predeceſſors fallible, and ſome, though but a few, who thought themſelves ſo too. Among theſe *Adrian* VI. like a modeſt and honeſt man, when he was actually Pope, continued to own in general, and without exception, that the Biſhop of *Rome* might fall into Error. *Maimbourgs* words are theſe.

'*Adrian* VI. in his *Commentaries upon the 4th of the Sen-*'*tences*, ſays poſitively, and in a moſt deciſive manner, That 'he is certain, the Pope may err 'even in matters belonging to 'Faith, teaching and eſtabliſh-'ing a Hereſie by his Definiti-'on, or by his Decretal.

Certum eſt, quod Pontifex poſſit errare etiam in iis, quæ tangunt fidem, Hæreſin, per ſuam determinationem aut Decretalem aſſerendo, cap. 15. pag. 183.

Hence it manifeſtly appears, that the French Catholicks are

in this regard, oppoſite to the Italian Papiſts. Therefore *Bellarmin* will not let this French Doctrine paſs, it being very prejudicial to the Intereſt of the papal Chair at *Rome*; but he contradicts it, *lib.* 4. *cap.* 2. *de Romano Pontifice*, and that very ſeverely, ſaying, (*videtur erronea, & Hæreſi proxima*) it ſeems to be wholly erroneous, and next in the world to Hereſie. Here let the Reader conſider how thoſe Doctors of the Popiſh Perſwaſion diſagree and contradict each other about their pretended infallible Judge or Guide in matters of Religion.

The French Divines and Pope *Adrian* VI hold, that the Pope is not infallible, and they ſay, that the diffuſive Church and a General Council is ſo. Then comes Cardinal *Bellarm.* with others like him, and gives them the lye; and then they of the other ſide, not willing to dye in this debt, do the like to him and his aſſociates.

If it be ſaid, that both parties had more manners than to tax one another with the lye in expreſs terms, that is true indeed, but yet they do the ſame in effect.

Finding this great diſcord amongſt them, I ſet aſide the whole Italian Sect at once, and could have been content, if the French party had been able to advance a model of an infallible Guide with any concord amongſt themſelves, and without contradicting one another.

But alas they alſo are full of Diſputes and Diſſentions, and the beſt model they deviſe is liable to very great exceptions. As for Diſputes and Controverſy the matter is thus; Some hold, that a General Council is the only infallible Guide and Judge in things appertaining to Religion, but they allow the Pope many great priviledges in the Council. For example, a General Council (ſay one party) cannot be called, but by the Popes Authority, or by his Conſent. And the opinion of theſe men is to be found in *Petrus de Marca* the late famous Archbiſhop of *Paris*, *lib.* 4. *de Concordia Sacerdotii & Imperii*, *cap.* 5. *parag.* 4.

Others affirm again, that the Civil Magiſtrate may call an extraordinary Council, which was the Judgment of the Univerſity of *Paris*, publickly declared by the Command of King *Charles* VIII. as may be ſeen in the 4*th Book of the Hiſtory of General Councils*,

Councils ſet forth by *Richerius* above mentioned. *C.* 2. and the ſame was likewiſe the judgment of the late Famous Archbiſhop of *Paris. Lib.* 6. *C.* 17. 4. *de concordia Sacerdotii & Imperii.*

A third ſort hold it not to be abſolutely neceſſary that the Pope ſhould have any hand in conſtituting a General Council, or in preſiding in it, or in ratifying the Decrees of it. And this is the Opinion of *Monſieur Maimbourg* in his Book concerning the Prerogatives of *Rome*, and her Biſhop. *Chap.* 16. *Pag.* 188, 189. The ſame Opinion is likewiſe maintained by *Richerius*, *Hiſtoria Concil. General. lib.* 1. *c.* 5. For in two General Councils, that is the ſecond and fifth, the Pope neither preſided by himſelf, nor by his Delegates; and the ſame *Richerius* diſproves the colours and pretences found out by *Baronius* and *Binius*, in order to make the World believe that the Pope had ſome preſidency in the Councils above named. Hitherto we find nothing in purſuit of this Infallible Guide, but uncertainty and confuſion, everlaſting Diſputes, and endleſs Quarrels. This I conſidered, and was exceedingly troubled, to find my ſelf ſo mightily deceived in my expectation.

But let us proceed farther, and ſee whether any thing in the World be conſiſtent, and credible in this French Doctrin: concerning their model of an Infallible Guide, I am content to ſet aſide the manifold Diſputes, concerning the nature and conſtitution of a Council, on condition I may find them well agreed for the reſt. Notwithſtanding, if they were perfectly agreed, and as harmonious as Muſick, yet there lies very many exceptions againſt their Opinion: for if a General Council be the only thing incapable of Error, then it follows inevitably, that there has been no viſible Infallible Guide upon earth for theſe 120 years laſt paſt. For it is ſo long ſince any thing pretending to be a General Council was in being. Therefore when the *French* Papiſts falſly charge the Proteſtants for having no certain groundwork, or foundation of their Faith, they do not conſider that the Proteſtants may return the charge, and ask thoſe Papiſts, where their Infallible Director is ſince the Council of *Trent* was diſſolved above 120 years ago.

If it be ſaid, that althô there is no Council now ſitting, yet Records and Writings, which contain the Canons and Decrees of Councils are yet extant, and may be conſulted. This makes a Writing capable of being a Guide or Director of our Faith, which is a thing the Romaniſts will not admit of. For when the Proteſtants affirm the written Word of God is only the Infallible Director, then they exeept againſt all Writings, as incapable of being any certain Directors, becauſe they may be wreſted by Interpretation to bear many Senſes: And upon this account they call the Holy Scripture a Leaden Rule and a Noſe of Wax.

Now for my part I cannot perceive but that the Canons and Decrees of dead Councils are liable to wreſting and misinterpretation as well as the Holy Scripture. Methinks the Biſhop of *Condom*'s Book is a very ſtrong proof of this; and many inſtances of the like I could give, but I ſhall omit them, becauſe it is notorious that the ſenſe of many Canons is exceedingly diſputable. Thus I plainly perceive upon the whole matter, that either Records of Councils are no infallible or ſufficient Guide, or if they be ſo, the Holy Scripture is much more ſuch. Whence it follows that the Proteſtants are in the right, by relying mainly upon the Scripture.

Certainly, if a Writing can afford infallible direction, the written Word of God has the beſt pretence in the World to that office: Therefore the Reformed Church hath reaſon in ſome reſpect to thank the *French* Papiſts; for althô their pretended unerring Director is not ſufficient, yet it ſuggeſts to them where they may find out one that is very ſufficient. Such will be the conſequence of that model of an Infallible Guide which is advanced, and defended by the *Gallican* Church, and by others that follow their method. But there are yet farther Inconveniences in it, enough to diſſatisfie any conſiderative perſon whatſoever. I was content (as you have heard) to paſs by the great Controverſie above mentioned, between the *Italian* and *French* men: I could have prevailed with my ſelf to have connived at the many diſſentions under which the *Gallican* Divines do labour, concerning

cerning the nature and conſtitution of a General Council. Yet after all, I perceive it is impoſſible to get to an end of their Controverſies, in ſo much that I am affraid I ſhall incumber the Reader with a tedious and long account of them. The thing that at preſent I ſhall conſider, is their diſſention concerning the extent of that Infallibility which they attribute to General Councils: For ſome extend the ſuppoſed Infallibility, attending the Councils aforeſaid, to all ſorts of Decrees, whether they concern Faith, or Practice; and this was the current ſenſe of the Univerſity of *Paris* 145 years ago; as appears by their concluſions concerning this affair, publickly agreed upon, and declared *Anno Dom.* 1542. by the Theological Faculty of that Univerſity, *Articulo* 22. 'It is certain (ſay they) that 'General Councils lawfully aſ-'ſembled, and repreſenting the 'Univerſal Church, cannot err 'in Decrees concerning Faith 'and the Church.

Certum eſt Concilium Generale legitime Congregatum univerſalem repreſentans Eccleſiam, in Fidei & Morum determinationibus errare non poſſe,

But of late the *Gallican* Doctors ſing a new ſong; they have departed from this Opinion of their Predeceſſors, and reſtrained their imagined Infallibility of Councils only to matters of Faith. And an account of this one may find, *p.* 9. of the Reflections made upon the firſt Anſwer, given to the *Papiſt Miſrepreſented and Repreſented.* Beſides it is in every bodies mouth, that has been educated in *France*, that in matters of Practice, Diſcipline, or Government; General Councils are not Infallible. Thus at one ſtroke the *French* Doctors of theſe laſt ages have cut off, at leaſt, in nine or ten parts from the extent of that Infallibility, which their Predeceſſors 145 years ago did aſcribe to the Decrees of Councils. For moſt certain it is, the Rules of Practice appertaining to Chriſtianity are (to ſpeak within compaſs) nine or ten times as many as the matters of Faith. So the modern *French* Clergy do hold a much leſs extended Infallibility then what was heretofore held and taught by the Theological Faculty of *Paris* above mentioned: and according to the modern Poſition or Doctrin we are deſerted by the unerring Guide in much

much the greater part of Chriſtianity, and may err and wander in all practical Points, and ſcatter as much as any Hereticks whatever.

Hereupon ſome perhaps will ſay, that although the Office of an infallible Conductor be reduced to a very ſmall compaſs, yet notwithſtanding it is better to have his help and aſſiſtance (as little as it is) than to want it. Truly there was a time when I thought ſo too: but then I conſidered, that moſt of thoſe Points controverted between Proteſtants and Papiſts are matters of practice: Therefore if the unerring direction of the Guide does not extend to practical Decrees, it follows that moſt of the points aforeſaid have not hitherto been infallibly determined in favour of the Church of *Rome*. The Worſhip of Images, the Adoration of the Groſs, the Worſhip of Angels and Saints, the half Communion, the Adoration of the Hoſt, and ſeveral other things are points of practice, and not properly matters of Faith. If it be ſaid, that the Decrees made by the Council of *Trent* concerning thoſe things do virtually and implicitly contain a point of Faith, by obliging us to believe the lawfulneſs or expediency of doing them, I anſwer, that the caſe of other Decrees about matters of Practice, Diſcipline, or Government is juſt the ſame: In ſo much that either all practical Decrees muſt for this reaſon be reducible to matters of Faith, or elſe the Decrees concerning Image Worſhip, half Communion, and the reſt abovementioned cannot be reduced to that kind, but muſt be rank'd among matters of Practice; and ſo are not capable of any infallible Determination, if the Deſcription of the Guide given by the French Divines be true. But if any man will maintain, that all practical Decrees are reducible to matters of Faith, for the reaſon aforeſaid, then the depoſing Canon of the *Lateran* Council is reducible to the ſame kind, and is conſequently eſtabliſhed in the Roman Church by an infallible Decree, which makes it an eſſential part of the Romiſh Church. Now this is that great inconvenience which the French Clergy do endeavour to avoid by reſtraining the unerring priviledge of the Councils to matters of Faith alone. They are ſenſible that ſeveral Conſtitutions and Decrees of Councils

cils are prejudicial to Rights of Sovereign Princes, and injurious to the Libertis of the Gallican Church; they are aware of the great miſchief, which thoſe Canons and Decrees made for depoſing Kings might bring upon them if their potent Monarch ſhould perceive that ſuch Doctrines are judged eſſential to the Religion of *Rome*; and for that reaſon they warily reſtrain the ſuppoſed Infallibility of Councils to matters of Faith alone, and ſo give themſelves room and ſcope enough to run down the depoſing Canons & Doctrines; and yet to pretend that they have an infallible Guide ſtill left in ſtore. But this deſign will be quite ruined, if practical Decrees are therefore eſteemed to be infallible becauſe they include or ſuppoſe a ſpeculative Doctrine concerning the lawfulneſs or expediency of things they enjoyn. For if ſuch Decrees and Conſtitutions are infallible, then they are eſſential parts of the Roman Catholick Religion, even the depoſing Canons among the reſt. So that I plainly ſee the Frenchmen will be neceſſitated, by truſting to the Conduct of their infallible Guide, either to own that Image-worſhip, Invocation of Saints, *&c.* neither yet are nor indeed ever can be decreed infallibly; or elſe they muſt own the Doctrine of depoſing Princes to be infallibly decreed, which is the thing they endeavour to avoid. The latter caſe makes their Guide miſchievous and dangerous, and the former makes him in a manner unſerviceable.

Thus we ſee what a miſerable confuſion theſe poor people have brought themſelves to, by pretending to find a viſible Judge of Controverſies incapable of Error among mortal men. They have made the greateſt part of Chriſtianity an uncertain thing (as far as in them lay) by removing it (as far as their Opinions could remove it) from its proper and natural baſis, that is, the Word of God; and by grounding it upon the teſtimony of an airy phantome, called an infallible Guide; but owned by themſelves to be liable enough to Error, and to have erred moſt grievouſly in matters of the greateſt importance. They ſay, this Guide cannot be miſtaken in matters of Faith; but in the concluſion, they cannot tell whatthey themſelves mean by that term [matters of Faith:] for although that term be of it ſelf clear enough,

yet they make the ſignification of it obſcure and uncertain, by confounding matters of Faith and matters of Practice, being not able, according to their Principles (for as much as I underſtand) to make any clear diſtinction between them. When I was brought to this great uncertainty, and did not know on what foundation to ground my Belief, or how to underſtand certainly the Commands of God, I remembred what was ſaid *Deuteron. chap.* 30. *verſ.* 11, 12, 13, 14. *The Commandment which I command thee this day is not hidden from thine eyes, nor is it far off. It is not in the Heaven above, that thou ſhouldſt ſay, who ſhall go up for us into Heaven, and bring it unto us, that we may hear it, and do it? neither is it beyond the Sea, that thou ſhouldſt ſay, who ſhall go over the Sea for us, and bring it unto us, that we may hear it, and do it? but the Word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that thou maiſt do it.* And the ſame thing is repeated in the New Teſtament by St. *Paul, Rom. c.* 10. *v.* 6, 7, 8. with an application of it to the Chriſtian Diſpenſation.

Having been thus taught of God, I underſtood that it was not neceſſary for me to ſeek an infallible Guide either in *Rome* or *France*; God has provided ſufficient means whereby we may know his Will in all Chriſtian Countrys, without going beyond the Sea to fetch the knowledge of it from afar off. His written Word is a Guide, whoſe Veracity cannot be queſtioned; and there are means to underſtand the true ſenſe of it, which are abundantly ſufficient, and infinitely better than the Romaniſts have to underſtand their pretended infallible Director: For that is a thing that no man certainly knows, neither what he is, nor where he is, neither how he is to be conſulted, nor how far he is to be truſted; which, doubtleſs, are lamentable defects in a thing called a Guide. The Word of God aſſuredly ought to be our Rule. And I am reſolved to follow it, according to the Direction given me by St. *Auguſtine.*

'Let no man ſay to me, O! 'what ſaid *Donatus, Parmenia-* 'nus, or *Pontius*, or any other of 'them? for neither ought we to

Nemo mihi dicat, O! quid dixit Donatus, aut Parmenianus, aut Pontius, aut aliquis alius illorum? quia nec cum Catholicis Epiſcopis

agree

'agree with Catholick Biſhops, 'if perhaps in ſome caſes they 'are ſo much miſtaken, as to en- 'tertain Opinions contrary to 'the Canonical Scriptures.

ſentiendum eſt, ſicubi fortè fallantur, ut contra Canonicas Scripturas aliquid ſentiant. Aug. de Unit. Eccleſiæ, c. 10.

Thus we ſee St. *Auguſtin* prefers the Guidance of Gods Word to the Direction of any one or more Biſhops, although accounted never ſo Catholick. It ſeemed ſtrange to me, that a matter of ſuch weight and conſequence as this is, the ſtay and prop of all Religion (as they term it,) and a thing that tends ſo much to the preſervation of Truth and Peace in the Church, ſhould not be taken notice of by the four Evangeliſts, who yet record many things of ſmaller importance.

That St. *Paul* ſhould hint nothing of it to that Church that pretends ſo mightily to it. That in his Epiſtle to the *Corinthians* (where he takes notice of their Schiſms, one being of *Paul*, another of *Apollos*, and a third of *Cephas*) he did not tell them, that they ought to require *Cephas* his Judgment for the Determination of their Differences.

That *Peter* himſelf, giving all diligence to mind the Chriſtians of what was needful, before his departure, ſhould forget to tell them of ſo neceſſary and ſo important an Article as this. That the Scriptures ſo frequently warn us of falſe Teachers, and falſe Prophets, that ſhould ariſe; and yet tell us nothing of this infallible Remedy; but rather put the cure of the evil upon the pains and diligence of the Chriſtians, in trying their Spirits. That the *Aſian* Biſhops, in their oppoſition againſt Pope *Victor*, and the *African* in their oppoſition to Pope *Stephen*, ſhould either not know of this priviledge of St. *Peters* Succeſſors, or not acknowledge it if they did. That St. *Auguſtin* and the Council of *Carthage* ſhould be ſo ill inſtructed in the Faith, as not to acknowledge it; but rather ſtand out ſo ſtiffly, as they did, in the caſe of Appeals. That the Popes, in the conteſt with him, ſhould be ſo ignorant of their own priviledges, as not to alledge their Infallibity in the Point, (which would have put a ſpeedy end to the Diſpute;) but rather take Sanctuary in a pretended Canon

of the Council of *Nice*. That ſo many Councils ſhould be called from diſtant parts of the world, to the expences of the Biſhops, and the hazard of their Churches, when there was a Remedy ſo near at hand, as the conſulting of the infallible Biſhop of *Rome* on all occaſions. And laſtly, that the Popes themſelves ſhould ſo far disbelieve it, as to contradict and reſcind the Decrees of one another. Theſe things ſeem to me ſuch mighty prejudices againſt this infallible Judg, that I know not how to anſwer them. To which I ſhall add, that inſtead of putting an end to Controverſies, and being a Cure to the evils of Chriſtendom (as is pretended,) it is the moſt expedient way to promote and continue them, by poſſeſſing that Church (which hath been the great cauſe of Diſputes) with an opinion of her own Infallibility, and conſequently rendring her incurable in her Errors, and incapable either of redreſſing them, or ſatisfying the Conſciences of them that diſſent from her. Conſequently St. *Auguſtine* expreſſes the ſame thing in another place more largely than above in his laſt mentioned paſſage, ſhewing nothing to have infallible Authority, except the holy Scripture, no not a General Council it ſelf.

'Who knows not (ſays he) 'that the holy Canonical Scri- 'pture, both of the old and new 'Teſtament, is comprehended 'within its own determined li 'mits, and that it is ſo far pre- 'ferred before the more modern 'Writings of Biſhops, as that it 'is unlawful to doubt or to diſ- 'pute about it, or to queſtion 'whether any thing manifeſtly 'written in it be true or right?

Quis autem neſciat ſanctam Scripturam Canonicam, tam veteris quam novi Teſtamenti, certis ſuis terminis contineri, eamque omnibus poſterioribus Epiſcoporum Literis ita præponi, ut de illâ omninò dubitari, aut diſceptari non poſſit, utrum verum vel utrum rectum ſit quicquid in eâ ſcriptum eſſe conſtiterit? Aug. lib. 2. contra Donat. cap. 3.

But he then immediately after tells us, that the caſe of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, of National Synods, and General Councils is quite otherwiſe.

'Who knows not that the 'Writings

Quis autem neſciat Epiſcopo-

'Writings of Biſhops, which 'either heretofore have been 'written, or are at preſent in 'compoſing, ſince the Canon 'of Scripture is eſtabliſhed, may 'lawfully be reprehended by 'a more ingenious Diſcourſe 'proceeding (it may be) from 'a perſon skilfuller in that af-'fair, or by the more grave Au-'thority of other Biſhops, or the 'Prudence of the more learned, 'or alſo by Councils? Moreo-'ver who knows not that Pro-'vincial or National Synods do 'yield without delay to the 'Authority of General Councils 'which are gathered out of all 'the Chriſtian world, and that 'General Councils precedent in 'time are often corrected by 'them that are ſubſequent.

rum Literas, quæ poſt confirmatum Canonem vel ſcriptæ ſunt, vel ſcribuntur, & per ſermonem fortè ſapientiorem cujuſlibet in eâ re peritioris, & per aliorum Epiſcoporum graviorem Authoritatem, doctiorúmque Prudentiam, & per Concilia licere reprehendi, ſi quid in eis forſan à veritate deviatum eſt, & ipſa Concilia, quæ per ſingulas Provincias vel Regiones fiunt plenariorum Conciliorum Authoritati, quæ fiunt ex univerſo orbe Chriſtiano ſine ullis ambagibus cedere, ipſaque plenaria priora ſæpe poſterioribus emendari. Aug. ubi ſupra.

Here we ſee, that according to St. *Auguſtine*, nothing but the Word of God is eſteemed incorrigible or infallible, not ſo much as a General Council. Therefore I am reſolved to follow this Doctrine, and to adhere to the Word of God, as my only Rule. And becauſe I find that the Church of *England* in this particular agrees moſt exactly with St. *Auguſtine*, for that reaſon I will henceforth embrace the Communion of that Church.

CHAP

CHAP. III.

Of Tranſubſtantiation.

THE third Motive of my Converſion is my diſlike to the modern Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, and I may well call it ſo, becauſe it was diſliked by the antient Fathers, and was full 1215 Years before it could obtain the credit to be defined as an Article of Faith; for it was not defined ſuch till the Council of *Lateran* held the above mentioned Year under *Innocent* III. and the Teſtimonies of the Fathers & Councils (as hereafter you ſhall ſee) are ſo decretory againſt it that the learned Arch-Biſhop of *Paris* doth ingeniouſly acknowledg it: And for the juſtification of it they have been forced to corrupt their Logick and their Natural Philoſophy, the better to ſeaſon Young Novices for the reception of it in Divinity, and maintain ſuch Paradoxes in them both, that if the Proteſtants had the ill Fate to take them up they long ago had been hiſſed out of the Schools for defending them.

Petr. Mar. Tract. de Euchariſt.

Such are the propoſition of accidents exiſting without a ſubject, and the poſſibility of one Body being in divers places at the ſame time: they have deſtroyed the nature of a Sacrament by taking away the Viſible Sign, and have ſtretched the words of Inſtitution to a ſenſe that many of their own Writers did not believe before it was defined; and ſome have ſince been ſo candid as to confeſs that they could not ſee the meaning of Tranſubſtantiation in the Text, if it were not for the authority of the church. They are forced to tell all men loudly to their faces, that four of their Senſes are miſtaken about their proper Object, when neither the Medium nor the Organ are indiſpoſed. That there is no Bread there at all, thô they ſee, feel, ſmell and taſte Bread. That the Senſes of this or that man, are not only miſtaken, (which is ſomewhat pardonable) but the Senſes of all mankind, at all times, and in all places, whenſoever they receive

receive the Euchariſt, nay that they are engaged ſo fatally in the miſtake, that they are never like to be retrieved out of it, thô they uſe their utmoſt care to detect the fallacy. They are forced to contradict the common reaſon of mankind, and maintain Propoſitions, that ſound Reaſon doth abhor in all other inſtances.

Sound Reaſon tells us, that one Body can be but in one place at one time, that it muſt have *partes extra partes*, diſtant in ſituation, and impenetrable; that it muſt have a quantity and extenſion; that Accident cannot ſubſiſt without a Subject, that converſion of one Subſtance into another cannot be without a change in the Accidents.

But in the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation we are taught to disbelieve all theſe Principles. The Body of Chriſt is at the ſame time in many places far diſtant from one another; it is glorious in Heaven, and on Earth ſubject to a thouſand diſhonours; it occupies a certain place there, but in the Hoſt it takes up none, but is (in manner like a Spirit) in an indiviſible point: it moves in one place, and reſts in another: it is elevated in one place, and depreſſed in another; and all at the ſame time and ſeaſon. That the Body of Chriſt is without quantity and extenſion; that there is length, and nothing long; breadth, and nothing broad; roundneſs, and nothing round; thickneſs, and yet nothing thick. That the Body of Chriſt doth exiſt without its accidents and eſſential properties; and the accidents, of Bread and Wine without a ſubject; and yet theſe accidents ſhall do ſtill the ſame ſeats, and ſerve a man to as uſuall purpoſes as if the ſubſtance were with them; a man may feed upon them, and be nouriſhed with them, and have his Spirit cheered, and refreſhed with the colour, and ſmell of Wine thô he drink not a drop of it. Lo theſe are the paradoxes which the defenders of Tranſubſtantiation muſt be forced to take up for the juſtification of it; and they muſt ſtill ſeem ſo to me, till I meet with a clear and ſatisfactory anſwer to them. There was a time when I was content to ſwallow them as well as others; the prejudice of Education and Authority of the

Church

Church, had ſo great an influence upon me, that I did not conſider them as I ought; but, as by the bleſſing of God I have ſhaked off the prejudice of the one, ſo I am ſtill willing to pay a deference to the authority of the other; if it can be made good that ſhe hath authority, to impoſe things on my Belief that thwart my Senſes, and contradict common Principles of Reaſon.

This monſtrous, and lately framed figment of human invention, (I mean) the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation, is ſo far from being Primitive and Apoſtolick, that we know the time it began to be owned publickly for an Opinion; and the very Council, in which it was ſaid to be paſſed into a publick Doctrin, and by what arts it was promoted, and by what perſons it was introduced.

For all the World knows, that by their own Parties, by (*a*) *Scotus*, by (*b*) *Ocham*, (*c*) *Biel*, *Fiſher* Biſhop (*d*) of *Rocheſter*, and divers others whom (*e*) *Bellarmine* calls moſt acute and learned men: It was declared that the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* is not expreſſed in the Canon of the Bible; that in the Scriptures there is no place ſo expreſs, (as without the Churches declaration) to compel us to admit of Tranſubſtantiation; and therefore at leaſt it is to be ſuſpected of Novelty. But further, we know that it was but a diſputable Queſtion in the ninth and tenth Ages after Chriſt; that it was not pretended to be an Article of Faith till the *Lateran* Council in the time of *Innocent* III. 1215 Years after Chriſt; that ſince that pretended (*f*) determination divers of the chiefeſt Teachers of their own ſide have no more been ſatisfied of the ground of it than they were before, but ſtill have publickly affirmed that the Article is not expreſſed in Scripture; (*g*) particularly *Johannes de Baſſolis*, Cardinal *Cajetan*, and *Melchior Canus*; beſides thoſe above reckoned: And therefore if it was not expreſſed in Scripture it will be clear that they made their Article out of their own heads; for they could not

(*a*) In 4. lib Sentent. d. 11. q. 3. (*b*) ibid. q. 6. (*c*) Lect. 40. in can. miſſæ. (*d*) Cap. cont. captivit. Babyl. (*e*) De Euchar. lib. 3. cap. 23. ſect. 2. dicit.

(*f*) Venere quidem tunc multa in conſultationem, nec decerni tamen aperte quicquam potuit. Platina in vita Innocent III.

(*g*) apud Suar. tom. 3. diſp. 46. ſect. 3. loc. com. lib. 3. fund. 2.

not declare it to be there if it was not; and if it be there but obscurely, then it ought to be taught accordingly; and at most it could be but a probable Doctrine, and not certain as an Article of Faith.

But that we may put it past Argument and Probability, it is certain, That as the Doctrine was not taught in Scripture expressly, so it was not taught at all as a Catholick Doctrine, or as an Article of Faith by the Primitive Ages of the Church.

Now in order to make this appear, we have the Confessions of many Authors very much esteemed by the Church of *Rome*, whose authorities have been most exactly collected and examined by the learned Bishop *Taylor*, to whom I own my self much indebted for my Conversion.

For the further manifestation of the incontroulable truth of this point, we need no other proof but the confession and acknowledgment of the great Doctors of the Church of *Rome*. *Scotus* says, *That before the* Lateran *Council Transubstantiation was no Article of Faith*, as *Bellarmine* confesses; and *Henriquez* affirms that *Scotus* says, *It was not antient*; insomuch that *Bellarmine* accuses him of Ignorance, saying, *He talked at that rate because he had not read the* Roman *Council under Pope* Gregory VII. *nor that consent of Fathers which* (to little purpose) *he had heaped together.* *Rem Transubstantionis Patres ne attigisse quidem*, said some of the English Jesuites in Prison. The Fathers have not so much as touched or medled with the matter of Transubstantiation. And in *Peter Lombard*'s time it was so far from being an Article of Faith, or Catholick Doctrine, that they did not know whether it were true or no: And after he had collected the Sentences of the Fathers in that Article, he confessed, He could not tell whether there was any substantial change or no. His words are these.

If it be enquired what kind of Conversion it is, whether it be formal or substantial, or another kind? I am not able to define it: only I know that it is not formal, because the same Accidents remain, the same Colour and Taste. To some it seems to be substantial, saying that the Substance is changed, that it is done essentially, to which the former authority seems to consent.

Lib. 3. de Euch. c. 23 Sect. unum tamen. Sum. l. 8 c. 20.

Discurs. modest. p. 13.

L. 4. Sententiarum dist. 11.

But to this Sentence others oppoſe theſe things, if the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine be ſubſtantially converted into the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, which before was not the Body, then every day ſome ſubſtance is made the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, which was not his Body before. And to day ſomething is Chriſts Body which yeſterday was not: and every day Chriſts Body is increaſed; and is made of ſuch matter, of which it was not made in the conception. Theſe are his words, which I have remarked, not only for Arguments ſake, (though it be unanſwerable;) but to give a plain demonſtration, that in his time this Doctine was new, not the Doctrine of the Church. And this was written about (*a*) fifty years before it was ſaid to be decreed in the *Lateran* (*b*) Council: And therefore it made haſte, in ſo ſhort a time to paſs from a diſputable Queſtion to an Article of Faith. But even after the Council (*c*) *Durandus*, as good a Catholick, and as famous a Doctor, as any was in the Church of *Rome*, publickly maintained, that even after Conſecration the very matter of Bread remained; and although he ſays, *that by reaſon of the Authority of the Church it is not to be held, yet it is not only poſſible it ſhould be ſo, but it implies no contradiction, that it be Chriſts Body, and yet the matter of Bread remain.* And if this might be admitted, it would ſalve many difficulties which ariſe from ſaying, that the ſubſtance of Bread does not remain. But here his Reaſon was overcome by Authority, and he durſt not affirm that which alone he was able to give (as he thought) a reaſonable account of. But by this it appears that the Opinion then was but in the forge: and by all their underſtanding they could never accord it, but ſtill the Queſtions were uncertain, and the Opinion was not determined at *Lateran*, as it is now held at *Rome*. It is alſo plain, that it is a ſtranger to antiquity. *De Tranſubſtantiatione Panis in Corpus Chriſti rara eſt in antiquis Scriptoribus mentio*, ſaid *Alphonſus à Caſtro*. 'There is ſeldom mention made in the ancient Wri-'ters of Tranſubſtantiating the Bread into Chriſts Body. I know the modeſty and intereſt of the man, he would not have ſaid, it had

(*a*) Ad Annum 1160.
(*b*) Ad Annum 1215.
(*c*) Secund. Buchol. An. Dom. 1271. ſed ſecund. Volaterranum 1335. in 4. lib. Sentent. diſt. 11. q. 1. ſect. propter tertium.
De Hereſ. l. 8. verbo Indulgentia.

had been *ſeldom*, if he could have found it in any reaſonable degree warranted: he might have ſaid, and juſtified it, there was no mention at all of this Article in the primitive Church. And that it was a meer ſtranger to Antiquity, will not be denyed by any ſober perſon, who conſiders that it was with ſo much uneaſineſs entertained even in the corrupteſt and moſt degenerate times, and argued and unſettled almoſt 1300 years after Chriſt. And that it was ſo, will but too evidently appear by the ſtating and reſolution of this Queſtion, which we find in the Canon Law. For *Berengarius* was by Pope *Nicholaus* commanded to recant his Errors in theſe words, and to affirm, *Verum Corpus & Sanguinem Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti ſenſualiter non ſolum in Sacramento, ſed in veritate manibus Sacerdotum tractari, frangi, & fidelium dentibus atteri.* 'That the true Body and Blood of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt 'ſenſually not only in the Sacrament, but in truth is handled by 'the Prieſts hands, and broken, and grinded by the teeth of the 'faithful. Now although this was publickly read at *Rome* before 115 Biſhops, and by the Pope ſent up and down the Churches of *Italy*, *France* and *Germany*; yet this day it is renounced by the Church of *Rome*; *and unleſs it be well expounded* (ſays the Gloſs) *will lead unto Hereſie.* But however this may be, it is plain they underſtood it not, as it is now decreed. But, as it happened to the *Pelagians* in the beginning of their Hereſie, they ſpake rudely, ignorantly, and eaſily to be reproved; but being aſhamed, and diſputed into a more ſober underſtanding of their Hypotheſis, they ſpake more warily, but yet differently from what they ſpake at firſt. So it was and is in this Queſtion; at firſt they underſtood it not, and it was too unreaſonable in any tolerable ſenſe to make any thing of it, but experience and neceſſity hath brought it to what it is. But that this Doctrine was not the Doctrine of the firſt and beſt ages of the Church, theſe following Teſtimonies do make evident. The words of *Tertullian* are theſe, *The Bread being taken and diſtributed to his Diſciples, Chriſt made it his Body, ſaying, this is my Body, that is, the Figure of my Body.*

Cap. Ego Bereng. conſecr. diſt. 2.

Adverſ. Marcion. l. 4. c. 40.

Contra Tryph. Judæ.

The ſame is affirmed by *Juſtin Martyr*: *The Bread of the Euchariſt was a Figure, which Chriſt the Lord commanded to do in remembrance of his Paſſion.*

In Dialog contra Mar. Collectis ex Maximo tempore Commodi & Severi Imper.

Origen calls the Bread and the Chalice, *the Images of the Body and Blood of Chriſt.* And again, *that Bread which is ſanctified by the Word of God, ſo far as belongs to the matter (or ſubſtance) of it, goes into the belly, and is caſt away in the ſeceſſion, or ſeparation, which to affirm of the natural and glorified Body of Chriſt were greatly blaſphemous: and therefore the Body of Chriſt which the Communicants receive, is not the Body in a natural ſenſe, but in a ſpiritual, which is not capable of any ſuch accident, as the Elements are.*

In Matt. 13.

Demonſtr. Evangel. l. 1. c. 1 & ult. h. 2.

Euſebius ſays, *that Chriſt gave to his Diſciples the Symbols of Divine Oeconomy, commanding the Image and Type of his own Body to be made.* St. *Macarius* ſays, *that in the Church is offered Bread and Wine, the Antitype of his Fleſh, and of his Blood; and they that partake of the Bread that appears do ſpiritually eat the Fleſh of Chriſt.* By which words the ſenſe of the above cited Fathers is explicated. For when they affirm, that in this Sacrament is offered the Figure, the Image, the Antitype of Chriſts Body and Blood, although they ſpeak perfectly againſt Tranſubſtantiation; yet they do not deny the real and ſpiritual preſence of Chriſts Body and Blood, which we all believe as certainly as that it is not tranſubſtantiated, or preſent in a natural and carnal manner.

The ſame is alſo fully explicated by the good St. *Ephrem.*

De ſacris Antiochi legibus apud Photium, l. 1. c. 229.

The Body of Chriſt received by the faithful departs not from the ſenſible ſubſtance, and is undivided from a ſpiritual Grace. For even Baptiſm being wholly made ſpiritual, and being that which is the ſame, and proper of the ſenſible ſubſtance, I mean of Water, ſaves; and that which is born doth not periſh.

St. *Gregory Nazianzen* ſpake ſo expreſly in this Queſtion, as if he had undertaken on purpoſe to confute the Article of *Trent*;

Orat. 2. in Paſch.

Now we ſhall be partakers of the Paſchal Supper, but ſtill in figure, though more clear than in the old Law. For the legal Paſſover (I will not be afraid to ſpeak it) was an obſcure Figure of a Figure.

St.

St. *Chryſoſtom* affirms dogmatically, *that before the Bread is ſanctified we name it bread, but the Divine Grace ſanctifying it by the means of the Prieſt, it is freed from the name of Bread, but is eſteemed worthy to be called the Lords Body, although the nature of Bread remains in it.*

Epiſt. ad Caeſ. contr. Hæreſ. Apollinarii, cit. per Damaſc. & Coleſt. Senten. Pp. contr. Severianos, edit per Tunian. h. 23. in 1 Cor.

To theſe very many more might be added, but inſtead of them the words of St. *Auguſtin* may ſuffice, as being an evident conviction what was the Doctrine of the primitive Church in this Queſtion: This great Doctor brings in Chriſt ſpeaking thus to his Diſciples; *You are not to eat this Body which you ſee, or drink that Blood which my Crucifiers ſhall pour forth. I have commended to you a Sacrament, which being ſpiritually underſtood ſhall quicken you.* And again, *Chriſt brought them to a Banquet, in which he commended to his Diſciples the Figure of his Body and Blood; (for he did not doubt to ſay, this is my Body, when he gave the Sign of his Body; and that which is by all men called a Sacrifice, is the Sign of the true Sacrifice, in which the Fleſh of Chriſt, after his Aſſumption, is celebrated by the Sacrament of Remembrance.*

In Pſalm 98.

But in this particular the Canon Law it ſelf, and the Maſter of the Sentences, are the beſt Witneſſes, in both which Chollections there are divers Teſtimonies brought; eſpecially from St. *Ambroſe* and St. *Auguſtin*, which whoſoever can reconcile with the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, may eaſily put a Civet and Dog, a Pidgeon and a Kite into couples, and make Fire and Water enter into natural and eternal Friendſhips.

De Conſecrat. diſt. 1. c. qui manducant, & c. prima quidem, & c. non hoc corpus, & c. quid patrar.

Theodoret and Pope *Gelaſius* ſpeak more emphatically even to the nature of things, and the Philoſophy of the Queſtion; *Chriſt honoured the Symbols and Signs* (ſaith *Theodoret*) *not changing the Nature, but to Nature adding Grace, which Symbols are ſeen with the title of his Body and Blood. For neither do the myſtical Signs recede from their Nature; for they abide in their proper ſubſtance, figure and form, and may be ſeen, touched,* &c. And

Sentent. lib. 4. diſt. 11. dialog. 1. c. 8.

Dialog 2. c. 24.

for

for a Teſtimony that will be eſteemed infallible, I alledge the words of Pope *Gelaſius*; *Truly the Sacraments of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, which we receive, are a divine thing, for that by them we are made partakers of the Divine Nature, yet ceaſes not to be the ſubſtance, or nature of Bread and Wine.* And truly an image and ſimilitude of the Body and Blood of Chriſt are celebrated in the action of the myſteries.

De Duabus Nat. contra Eutych. & Neſtor. videatur Picherel. in Diſſert. de miſſa, & expoſitione verborum Inſtitutionis cœnæ Domini.

If the Patrons of this novelty be not yet ſatisfied by what is already ſaid in reference thereunto, let them ſee and diligently mark theſe following Councils; *Ancyranum anno Domini* 314. *Can.* 2. *Neocæſarienſe anno eodem Can.* 13. *Nicenum* 1. *an.* 325. *in act. lib.* 2. *c.* 3. *Laodicenum ann.* 364. *Can.* 25. *Carthaginenſe ann.* 397. *Can.* 24. *Aurelianenſe ann.* 541. *Can.* 4. *Toletanum* 4. *an.* 633. *Can.* 17. *Bracarenſe ann.* 675, *C.* 2. *Toletanum* 16. *ann.* 693. *C.* 6. *Conſtantinopolitanum in Trullo ann.* 691. *Can.* 32. and if there be any ſhame in them, they will never brag of Antiquity to patronize them therein: for they are diametrically repugnant unto them in this behalf.

Now from theſe premiſes I am not deſirous to inſer any odious conſequences in reproof of the Church of *Rome*; but I think my ſelf bound in conſcience to ſwerve from it, and judge it my duty to give caution and admonition to all other well diſpoſed Chriſtians to do ſo likewiſe.

1. That they be not abuſed by the Rhetorical words and high expreſſions alledged out of the Fathers, calling the Sacrament the Body or Fleſh of Chriſt: For we all believe it is ſo, and rejoyce in it. But the Queſtion is, after what manner it is ſo, whether after the manner of Fleſh, or after the manner of ſpiritual Grace, or ſacramental conſequence? I, with the holy Scriptures, and primitive Fathers, affirm the latter, the Church of *Rome*, againſt the words of Scripture, and the Explication of Chriſt, affirm the former.

Jo. 6. 36.

2. That they be careful not to admit ſuch Doctrines, under the pretence of being ancient, ſince although the Roman Error had

had been ſo long admitted, and is ancient in reſpect of our days, yet it is an Innovation in Chriſtianity, and brought in by Ignorance, Power and Superſtition very many ages after Chriſt.

3. I exhort them, that they remember the words of Chriſt, when he explicates the Doctrine of giving us his Fleſh for Meat, and his Blood for Drink, that he tells us, *the Fleſh profiteth nothing: but the Words which I ſpeak are Spirit, and they are Life.* Ut ſupra.

4. That if theſe ancient and primitive Doctors above cited ſay true, and that the Symbols ſtill remain the ſame in their natural ſubſtance and properties even after they are bleſſed, and when they are received, and that Chriſts Body and Blood are only preſent to Faith and Spirit, that then whoever attempts to give Divine Honour to theſe Symbols, or Elements, (as the Church of *Rome* does), attempts to give a Creature the due and incommunicable propriety of God; and that then this evil paſſes further than an error in the underſtanding, for it carrys them to a dangerous practice, which cannot reaſonably be excuſed from the crime of Idolatry.

To conclude, this matter of it ſelf is an error ſo prodigiouſly great and dangerous, that I need not tell of the horrid and blaſphemous Queſtions which are ſometimes handled by them of the Church of *Rome* concerning this divine myſtery. As if a Prieſt going by a Bakers Shop, and ſaying with an Intention, *Hoc eſt Corpus meum*, whether all the Bakers Bread be turned to Chriſts Body? whether a Church-mouſe does eat her Maker? whether a man by eating the conſecrated Symbols does break his faſt? for if it be Bread and Wine he does not, and if it be Chriſts Chriſts Body and Bloud naturally and properly, it is not Bread and Wine. Whether it may be ſaid, the Prieſt in ſome ſenſe is the Creator of God himſelf? whether his Power be greater than the Power of Angels and Archangels? For that it is ſo, is expreſly affirmed by *Caſſeneus*. Whether (as a *Bohemian* Prieſt ſaid) that a Prieſt before he ſays his firſt Maſs be the Son of God, but afterward he is the Father of God, and Creator of his Body? But theſe things are too bad, and Gloria mundi. Anno Duo

therefore

therefore I love not to rake in ſo filthy channels, but give only general warning to all them whom I wiſh well, to take heed of ſuch perſons, who, from the proper conſequences of their new found Articles, grow too bold and extravagant, and of ſuch Doctrines, from whence theſe and many other evil Propſitions frequently do iſſue. As the Tree is, ſuch muſt be the Fruit. But I hope it may be ſufficient to ſay, that what the Church of *Rome* teaches of Tranſubſtantiation, is abſolutely impoſſible, and implies contradictions very many, to the belief of which no Faith obligeth me, and no Reaſon can endure.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Half Communion.

THE fourth Motive of my Converſion is another piece of Novelty I was much diſſatisfied with, and that is, the Half Communion. And the more I inquired into the Word of God, and the Senſe of the primitive Church concerning it, the more I found cauſe to diſlike it. Certainly the common Reaſon of all men, that are Chriſtians, cannot but ſuggeſt unto them, that every Command, Order and Inſtitution of Chriſt ought to be accounted extremely ſacred, and that whatever he has appointed ſhould be obſerved moſt religiouſly, without any deviation from the Rule which he hath delivered.

Now upon examination I found, that the Church of *Rome* had made a very unwarrantable and a ſtrange alteration in the Adminiſtration of the Sacrament, by detaining the Cup from the people: and therefore (I hope) no rational man can blame me for rejecting Communion with her, and adhering to that Religion of the Reformed Church, where I ſaw the Command of our Saviour carefully obſerved, and his Inſtitution moſt obſequiouſly followed. And becauſe I do here enter upon an Accuſation of the Church of *Rome*, it is reaſonable I ſhould in the firſt place ſet down what I apprehend to be the Doctrine of that party

party concerning this matter, and then I will endeavour to demonſtrate, that both the Doctrine and Practice of it are repugnant to the Word of God, and to the Doctrine and Practice of the primitive Church. It is pretended by the Romaniſts, that they have made no change in any thing material or eſſential to the Sacrament: For they reſolutely affirm, that the giving of the Cup to the people is an indifferent thing, and may be done or omitted, as the Rulers of the Church ſhall judge convenient. Some of them proceed farther, and pretend that receiving the Bread alone was leſs or more the practice of all ages, ſince the beginning of Chriſtianity. Many conjectures and ſurmiſes have been invented by *Bellarmin* and others in order to make this ſeem likely, and yet all in vain: For many learned men of the Roman Catholick party are aſhamed of this pretence, and ingenuouſly confeſs, that there never was any ſuch practice approved amongſt the Ancients.

Alphonſus à Caſtro, aſſerting the lawfulneſs of the peoples communicating in both kinds, hath theſe words, (ſaith he)

'For I have learned from the 'Writings of many holy men, 'that anciently for many ages 'it was the cuſtom for all Ca- 'tholiques to communicate ſo.

Nam olim per multa ſæcula ſic apud omnes Catholicos uſurpatum eſſe, ex multorum ſanctorum ſcriptis didicimus. Alphonſ. titul. Euchariſt. Hæreſ. 13.

Lindanus a great maintainer of Popery affirms, that both kinds were generally received in the Euchariſt even till the year 1260. *Panopliæ lib.* 4. *c.* 56. in theſe words,

'I now omit other things (ſays 'he) which make for this pur- 'poſe, to wit, that till the age of 'St. *Thomas*, that is, till the year 'of our Lord 1260. the Com- 'munion in both kinds was al- 'moſt every where adminiſtred 'to the Laity, but not every 'where; perhaps dangers and 'ſcandals ariſing from ſpilling

Omitto nunc alia, quæ huc faciunt, quod in ætatem uſque Divi Thomæ 1. *ann. Domini* 1260. *utriuſque ſpeciei Communio ferè ubique fuerit Laicis adminiſtrata, ſed non ubique; periculis fortè & effuſi Sanguinis Domini, ſcandalis unà cum populis negligentia, & pietatis detrimento in-*

'the Blood of Chriſt, together 'with the peoples negligence, 'and the decay of Piety becom-'ing every day greater, the 'Communion of both kinds gra-'dually degenerated into one.

crebeſcentibus paulatim utriuſque ſpeciei Communio in unam degeneravit.

Albaſpinæus, the late learned Biſhop of *Orleans* in *France*, undertakes to confute ſeveral of *Bellarmins* Conjectures about the pretended Antiquity of the Half Communion, eſpecially his fancy that the Lay-communion, a thing ſometimes mentioned by the ancient Writers, was a cuſtom of the peoples, receiving only in one kind: and upon this occaſion *Albaſpinæus* hath theſe words following.

'But if we grant that which 'by all means we ought to ac-'knowledge, to wit, that in 'thoſe times, when the Coun-'cils and Fathers made menti-'on of the Lay-Communion, 'the people did partake of both 'kinds: it follows, that this (*i.e.*) 'Lay-Communion is not par-'ticipating of the Sacrament 'under one kind.

Atqui ſi detur quod concedi omnino neceſſe eſt, quo tempore Concilia & Patres de Communione Laicâ mentionem fecerunt, Laicos ſub utraque ſpecie communicâſſe: ſequitur non eſſe ſub una ſpecie Communionem. lib. 1. Obſervat. cap. 4.

There are two remarkable places in Cardinal *Bona*, *lib.* 2, *c.* 18. *de Rebus Liturgicis*, to prove that the Communion in one kind was not practiſed till the year 1200. and that all the precedent ages had the contrary practice, and gave both kinds to the people publickly. He pretends beſides, but indeed without any conſiderable ground, that the Half Communion was privately practiſed in thoſe ages. Theſe are his ſayings,

'It is certain (ſays he) that 'all perſons in all places, Cler-'gy and people, men and wo-'men, did anciently receive the 'holy myſteries in both kinds 'when they were preſent at the

Certum eſt quippe omnes paſſim Clericos & Laicos, viros & mulieres ſub utraque ſpecie ſacra myſteria antiquitus ſumpſiſſe cum ſolemni eorum Celebrationi ade-

'publick

'publick Celebration, when 'they offered, and did partake 'of the Offerings.

rant & offerebant, & de Oblatis participabant.

And a little after,

'For always and every where, 'from the infancy of the Church 'till the 12th age, the faithful 'received the Communion under both kinds, of Bread and 'Wine; and the cuſtom of the 'Cup in the beginning of that 'age began by little and little to be diſuſed.

Semper enim & ubique, ab Eccleſiæ primordiis uſque ad ſæculum duodecimum, ſub ſpecii Panis & Vini communicârent fideles, cæpitque paulatim ejus ſæculi initio uſus calicis obſoleſcere.

Thus we ſee by the Teſtimonies already produced, that detaining the Cup from the people was no ancient practice, but began about 460 years ago. Theſe Authors here cited being Papiſts are a ſufficient proof of this, and many more of the ſame Perſwaſion might be brought to confirm the ſame, which at preſent I omit, that I may ſhun tediouſneſs. But the thing which upon examination I found my ſelf obliged principally to conſider, was not only what had been the ancient practice in this matter, but alſo what the reaſon & ground was which moved the holy Fathers and the primitive Church generally (as well Laity as Clergy) to believe themſelves moſt ſtrictly bound to receive both kinds. For that they had ſuch a Belief, the Authorities which I ſhall hereafter alledge will convincingly demonſtrate, and the reaſon and ground of this their Perſwaſion was the Command and Inſtitution of Chriſt. He had ordered in the Goſpel, that all ſhould drink of the Cup, and they, with great Piety and Reverence to his Command, accounted themſelves all obliged to do what he enjoyned them.

This certainly is nothing but what ought to be done. And I heartily wiſh the Church of *Rome* had retained the like veneration and pious regard for the Command of Chriſt; I ſhould then have found no cauſe to blame her in this particular.

Now becauſe I have here in effect aſſerted, that the Command of Chriſt concerning the Sacrament was that which had influence

upon the Chriſtians of the eldeſt ages; I ſhall in the firſt place produce the Precept, and then ſubjoin immediately the Senſe of Antiquity to it, which will manifeſt that they thought the obligation ariſing from the Divine Precept did extend to all Believers without any diſcrimination; and if this be effectually performed, I ſuppoſe, it will be unneceſſary to adverti ſe the Reader, that the ſame apprehenſions concerning the neceſſity of receiving in both kinds ought to take place at all times, and in all Chriſtian Societies. The conſequence of which is, that the Roman Church is a notorious tranſgreſſor of Divine Law in this reſpect; and that the pretended indifferency of giving the Cup to the people, or withholding of it, is a falſe ſuppoſition.

Our Saviour, when he firſt appointed this Sacrament, delivered a Command, *Matt.* 26. 27. that all ſhould drink of the Cup; and after his Reſurrection he reinforced all the Precepts which he had given to his Diſciples, and conſequently this amongſt the reſt, *Matth.* 28. 19, 20. ſaying, *Go, teach all Nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt; teaching them to obſerve all things whatſoever I have commanded you.* We ſee hence how expreſs our Saviours words are, that all Nations ſhould be taught to obſerve whatever he commanded his Diſciples; who would think (if he ſaw it not before his eyes) that any Society of Chriſtians, that will needs be called the Catholick Church, ſhould avowedly trample under foot this manifeſt Command of God? They are ſo far from teaching all Nations to obſerve what Chriſt commanded his Diſciples, that they profeſſedly teach the quite contrary. Our Saviour ſaid, *Drink ye all of it.* No, ſays the Church of *Rome*, all ſhall not drink of it, but a few ſhall, that is, conſecrating Prieſts. One would imagine that theſe Texts of holy Scripture above mentioned ſhould make a deep impreſſion upon all men that pretend to have any regard for the Laws of God, and they did ſo till 1200 years after Chriſt, when the practice of detaining the Cup from the people began firſt to be introduced by a corrupt cuſtom, and was long afterwards eſtabliſhed by Pope *Martin* V. in the Council of *Conſtance.* So new and late is this Point of Popery, that

it

it was not conciliarly decreed till about 272 years ago. And yet nothing is more uſual with the Roman Catholicks, than to brag of the Antiquity of their Religion. I ſhall have an opportunity hereafter of conſidering this late Decree of Pope *Martin*, when I come to produce the ancient Canon of Pope *Gelaſius*, made near 1200 years ago, expreſly repugnant, and contary to this late Decree of *Martin*: For *Gelaſius* declares receiving in one kind to be ſacrilegious.

At preſent I ſhall proceed to alledge the Teſtimonies of the ancient Fathers, to ſhew that they underſtood our Saviours words [*Drink ye all of this*] agreeably to the Senſe of the Reformed Church of *England*; that is, ſo as to account all Chriſtians, without exception, obliged to partake of the Cup. But by the way, I cannot but obſerve, that *Paſchaſius Corbeienſis*, a man of great credit in the Church of *Rome*, for his Invention of Chriſts corporeal Preſence in the Hoſt, about the year 830, did expound the words above mentioned, contrary to the Senſe of the preſent Church of *Rome*, and in favour of the Proteſtants. His expreſſions are theſe.

'It is Chriſt that breaks this 'Bread, and by the hands of 'the Miniſters delivers it to 'the Believers. Likewiſe he 'gives them the Cup, ſaying, '*take, and drink ye all of this*, 'both the Miniſters and other 'Believers.

Chriſtus eſt qui frangit hunc Panem, & per manus Miniſtrorum tribuit credentibus. Similiter & calicem porrigit eis, dicens, accipite, & bibite ex hoc omnes tam Miniſtri, quam reliqui Credentes. Paſchaſ. de Cœna Domini, cap. 14.

Here we ſee *Paſchaſius* makes the Command to extend to all without any difference; and it is a wonder to me, why the Roman Catholicks do follow this man ſo zealouſly in his Invention of the corporeal Preſence of Chriſt in the Euchariſtical Bread, and will not admit of his Interpretation of this Command of Chriſt, that all Believers ſhould drink of the Cup.

But there are much more ancient and authentick Authors, who underſtood our Saviours words according to the Senſe of the Reformed Church of *England*, whoſe Teſtimonies hereafter follow,

ſollow, and that in reference of proving that the Membets thereof do not expound Scripture according to their own private Judgment, as it is falſely imputed to them by the wretched Author of *Pax Vobis*, Mr. *Manby* and others, who (as I plainly find) never underſtood any thing of the Doctrine of this Church concerning the Interpretation of Scripture.

The firſt ancient Writer, whoſe Authority I intend to make uſe of, is S. *Juſtin Martyr*, one that lived not long after the Apoſtolick age, and loſt his Life for the Profeſſion of the Chriſtian Faith. He in his ſecond Apology gives an account to the Emperor of the method and manner of Divine Service amongſt the Chriſtians, and coming to give an account of the Lords Supper, he does it thus;

'They that are called Deacons among us do diſtribute to every one preſent, that they may partake of the conſecrated Bread, and Wine, and Water.

Quæ apud nos vocantur Diaconi diſtribuunt unicuique preſentium ut participent de Pane, & Vino & Aquâ benedictis. Juſtin. Apol 2.

It is remarkable, that he ſays, the Deacons gave both kinds to every one preſent, and a little after he tells us, they did ſo; becauſe our Saviour in the Goſpel commanded them to do ſo.

'For (ſays he) the Apoſtles in the Books written by them, which are called the Goſpels, have taught us, that Jeſus commanded them to do ſo.

Nam Apoſtoli in Commentariis à ſe ſcriptis, quæ Evangelia vocantur, ita ſibi præcepiſſe Jeſum tradiderunt. Juſtin. Apol. 2. *ubi ſupra.*

Bellarmin pretends that this laſt expreſſion of S. *Juſtin*, concerning the Command of Chriſt, hath only relation to the Conſecration, not to the Adminiſtration of the Sacrament. But any man by reading the place will find the Cardinals words to be groundleſs: For the Command of Chriſt is offered by S. *Juſtin* as the reaſon of the whole procedure in celebrating the Sacrament, and not as particularly reſpecting the Conſecration of the Elements.

The ſecond antient Author, whoſe Teſtimony I ſhall produce as an uncontroulable Evidence in this behalf, is St. *Cyprian*, who flouriſhed principally about the Year 250. and not many Years after

after was put to death for his Religion. This Holy Martyr, in his Epiſtle to *Cæcilius*, reprehends the *Aquarians*, that were Hereticks, ſo called, becauſe in the Conſecration and Adminiſtration of this Holy Sacrament of our Lords Supper they made no uſe of Wine, but uſed Water inſtead of it. Now St. *Cyprian* reproves theſe *Aquarians* upon two accounts: Firſt in that they offered to Conſecrate without Wine; and ſecondly, in that they gave no Wine to the People; and in both reſpects he taxes them with a very great tranſgreſſion of the command and appointment of our Saviour. The former miſtake and irregularity of the *Aquarians* doth not concern the Roman Catholicks; becauſe they uſe Wine when they Conſecrate: But in the ſecond point they are like the *Aquarians*, and therefore do fall under the ſame cenſure with them. Let us hear what St. *Cyprian* ſays concerning this whole affair. He begins the Epiſtle by telling *Cæcilius*, That although many Reverend Biſhops did exactly obſerve our Lords Tradition (for ſo calls he the Command or Inſtitution of Chriſt) yet (ſays he) becauſe ſome out of Ignorance or ſimplicity in conſecrating the Cup of our Lord, and in adminiſtring it to the People, do not do that which Jeſus Chriſt our Lord God (the Teacher and Author of this Sacrifice) did, and taught: I judged it to be agreeable to good Conſcience, and neceſſary to write to you about this matter; that if any one be yet poſſeſſed with this Error, he may, by ſeeing the Light of Truth, return to the root and original of our Lords Tradition.

Tamen quoniam quidam vel ignoranter, vel ſimpliciter in Calice Dominico ſanctificando & plebi miniſtrando, non faciunt quod Jeſus Chriſtus Dominus & Deus noſter (hujus Sacrificii Auctor & Doctor) fecit, & docuit: religioſum pariter, ac neceſſarium duxi, de hoc ad vos literas facere, ut ſiquis in iſto errore adhuc teneatur ignoratio tuæ perſpecta ad radicem & originem Dominicæ Traditionis revertatur. Cypr. *Epiſt.* 63. *Pamilianæ editionis.*

And thus having eſtabliſht his foundation, namely that nothing ought to be done contrary to the Inſtitution of Chriſt;

in

in the firſt part of his Epiſtle he proves the neceſſity of uſing Wine in the Conſecration of the Sacrament; but in the later part he comes to conſider the great inconvenience and miſchief to the people that enſued from their being deprived of the Cup. And that which he chiefly takes notice of, was a great decay and failure of Chriſtian Courage, occaſioned (as St. *Cyprian* ſuppoſes) by this depravation of the Sacrament. For in times of Perſecution ſome learned (from the *Aquarians*) to abſtain from drinking the Conſecrated Wine, leaſt the ſmell of it ſhould diſcover that they have been at the Chriſtian Meetings in the Mornings: St. *Cyprians* Words are theſe. 'But the diſcipline 'and good order of all Religi- 'on and Truth is overthrown, 'unleſs what was ſpiritually 'commanded be faithfully ob- 'ſerved. But perhaps the caſe 'is, that ſome perſons in the 'Morning Sacrifices (or Sacra- 'ments) are afraid, leaſt by the 'favor of Wine they ſhould 'ſmell of Chriſts Blood, and ſo 'by this means our Chriſtian 'Brethren in times of Perſecu- 'tion begin to be ſlack, or 'backward in ſuffering for 'Chriſt, while at the Celebra- 'tion of the Sacrament they 'learn to be aſhamed of Chriſts 'Blood.

Cæterum omnis Religionis, et veritatis Diſciplina ſubvertitur, niſi id, quod ſpiritualiter præcipitur, fideliter obſervetur, niſi ſi ſacrificiis matutinis hoc quis veretur, ne per ſaporem vini redoleat ſanguinem Chriſti: ſic ergo incipit in perſecutionibus a paſſione Chriſti fraternitas retardari dum in oblationibus diſcit de ſanguine ejus, et cruore confundi Cyp. Ep. 63. ubi ſupra.

And a little after the ſame Author ſays, 'How can we be- 'ing aſham'd to drink the Blood 'of Chriſt, ſpill our Blood for 'Chriſts ſake.

Quomodo autem poſſumus propter Chriſtem ſanguinem fundere qui ſanguinem Chriſti erubeſcimus bibere.

Beſides in another Epiſtle the ſame *S. Cyp.* writing to *Cornelius* the

the Biſhop of *Rome* concerning the reſtoring of certain delinquent Brethren (who in times of Perſecution had fallen into Idolatry, but by Repentance deſerved to be reconciled to the Church) urges the neceſſity of their being admitted into Communion; becauſe that ſince new Troubles and Perſecutions were coming on, it would be neceſſary to arm and fortifie all Believers with the Sacrament of the Lords Supper; and he inſiſts particularly upon the neceſſiy of giving them the Sacramental Cup. His expreſſions are theſe that follow,

'For after what a ſtrange 'manner do we teach and ex- 'cite them to loſe their Blood 'in confeſſing the Name of 'Chriſt, if we deny the Blood 'of Chriſt to them that are rea- 'dy to undergo ſuch a warfare? 'And how do we make them 'fit for the Cup of Martyrdom, 'if we do not admit them firſt 'by the right of Communion 'to drink our Lords Cup in the 'Church?

Nam quomodo docemus aut provocamus eos in confeſſione Nominis Chriſti ſanguinem ſuum fundere, ſi eis militaturis Sanguinem Chriſti denegamus? aut quomodo ad Martyrii poculum idoneos facimus, ſi eos priùs ad bibendum in Eccleſiâ poculum Domini jure Communicationis non admittimus? Cyp. Ep 54. Edit. Pamel.

It is obſervable that S. *Cyprian* here pleads for the peoples receiving the Cup from the right of Communion, that is, from the right which accrewed to every one, by his being made a member of the viſible Church.

By this paſſage, and the reſt before cited, it appears abundantly what the Judgment of this holy Martyr was, that he thought all Chriſtians obliged to receive the conſecrated Wine, and that the omiſſion of it was a tranſgreſſion of our Lords Commandment, and the deſtruction of ſeveral Chriſtian virtues, eſpecially of that courage and reſolution wherewith all Believers ought openly to profeſs the Name of Chriſt.

I might produce many more ancient Witneſſes of great credit, to make good what is here by me affirmed, but I ſhall content my ſelf, for brevitys ſake, with two others, whoſe Authority

doubtleſs ought to be paſt all exception with the Roman Catholicks; becauſe they were Popes or Biſhops of *Rome:* for anciently the Title of Pope was given to any eminent Biſhop. The firſt of theſe is *Leo*, the firſt of that name that was Biſhop in *Rome*; but before I produce his Teſtimony, it is neceſſary to obſerve that although his words are levelled againſt the *Manichees*, who ſuperſtitiouſly abhorred Wine; and therefore avoided receiving the Sacramental Cup: yet *Leo*'s words do abundantly ſhew what his Judgment was concerning that neceſſity, which as he thought did lye indiſpenſibly upon all Communicants to partake of the myſtical Blood of Chriſt;

'Conſequently (ſays he) when 'they venture to be preſent at 'our myſteries, they after ſuch 'manner do compoſt themſelves in partaking of the Sacraments, that ſometimes they 'very ſafely paſs undiſcerned; 'with an unprepared mouth 'they receive the Body, but altogether avoid the drinking of 'the Blood of our Redemption, 'which I would have you, holy 'Brethren, therefore to take no 'tice of, that by theſe indications 'ſuch men as theſe may be diſcovered to us; and that they, 'whoſe ſacrilegious diſſimulati 'on is found out by being obſerved, and detected, may be 'driven from the ſociety of the 'Saints by the Power of the 'Church.

Cumque ad tegendam infidelitatem ſuam noſtris audeant intereſſe myſteriis, ita in Sacramentorum Communione ſe temperant, ut interdum tutius lateant; ore indigno Chriſti Corpus accipiunt, Sanguinem autem Redemptionis noſtræ haurire omnino declinant; quod ideò veſtram ſcire volumus ſanctitatem, ut nobis hujuſmodi homines his manifeſtentur indiciis; & quorum fuerit deprehenſa ſacrilegia ſimulatio, notati, & proditi à Sanctorum ſocietate Sacerdotali Authoritate pellantur. Serm. 4. in Quadrageſ.

Hence it is manifeſt to any man of reaſon, that St. *Leo* lookt upon this practice of the *Manichees* as a moſt wicked and ſacrilegious thing, and he decrees no leſs a penalty for it than Excommu-

communication. Now it cannot be their inward and invisible superstition that he would have notice taken of, but it must be their external comportment in avoiding the consecrated Wine. Moreover if receiving the Cup had been an indifferent thing, and esteemed so in *Leo's* age, then the omission or declining of it, would have been no distinctive mark to discover the *Manichees* from the Orthodox or regular Communicants: For both might have done the same thing, and so the *Manichees* would have gone undiscovered. Hence I could not but conclude that *Leo*, and all Orthodox believers of his time, were of the same judgment in this point, with the Reformed Church of *England*, since that Reverend Bishop lookt upon receiving the Cup, as a certain sign of an Orthodox and true Christian, and esteemed the contrary practice an infallible marke of a detestable and sacrilegious Heretick.

And I am exceedingly confirmed in this Opinion, because I find that Pope *Gelasius* (one who sate in the Episcopal Chair of *Rome* about Thirty years after *Leo's* death) hath in a most publick, solemn, and authentick manner declared the necessity of Receiving in both kinds and the contrary practice to be sacrilegious; For he made a Canon against the corrupt custom of Receiving in one kind, which some superstitious people were then endeavouring to introduce: And this very Canon is to be found in *Gratians* Body of the Canon Law. *De Consecrat. dist.* 2. *c.* 12. It is in the Acts of the Councils. It is also in the Annals of *Cardinal Baronius ad annum* 496. But in short there is no doubt of its being the true and genuine Canon of *Gelasius* and consequently no man can rationally deny this to be a very convincing proof; that the judgment and practice of the ancient Bishops of *Rome*, was directly contrary to that of the Modern Bishops, and Church thereof. I shall here produce the words of the Canon it self; that the impartiall Reader may judge whether I had not reason to conclude, that the present *Roman* Church is guilty of Novelties, and that the Reformed Church of *England*, does punctually follow the sense of Antiquity.

But we find (says he) that some who having received the *Comperimus autem quod quidam sumpta tantummodo Corpus*

'portion of the Holy Body, do 'abſtain from the Cup of the 'Blood. Let theſe men with-'out all controverſy (becauſe 'they are informed againſt; as 'perſons poſſeſt with I know 'not what ſuperſtition) either 'receive the whole Sacrament 'or abſtaine from the whole: 'for a diviſion or parting of 'the one and the ſame miſtery 'cannot come to paſſe with-'out very great ſacriledge.

ſacri portione, à Calice Cruoris abſtineant: qui proculdubio, quoniam neſcio qua ſuperſtitione docentur obſtringi, aut integra ſacramenta percipiant; aut ab integris arceantur, quia diviſio vnius ejuſdemque myſterii ſine grandi ſacrilegio non poteſt provenire. Gratian. de conſecrat. diſt. 2. c. 12.

This ancient Canon (I find) hath given very ſtrange diſturbance to the modern Church of *Rome*: great ſtir hath been to avoid the force of it; if it were poſſible to be done: And becauſe it cannot be denyed, that this Canon or Decree was made by *Gelaſius* almoſt 1200 years ago. Therefore many interpretations have been deviſed to make it reconcilable, and conſiſtent with their preſent practice of detaining the Cup from the People.

The firſt device is to imagine and ſuppoſe without any manner of ground in the world, that this Decree only reſpects the Prieſts conſecrating the Hoſt. Thus we find the Author of the Annotations upon *Gratian* endeavouring to eſcape the difficulty. But undoubtedly neither the Proteſtants, nor any rational man, hath any reaſon to regard this vain and idle ſuppoſition. Eſpecially when ſo eminent a man, as Cardinal *Baronius* hath aſſured us; that this is a ſenſeleſſe and fooliſh ſolution. He calls it *frigidam ſolutionem ad annum* 496 *num.* 20. & 21. And ſays; *he rejects it, and hath no need of ſuch foolery.*

But there is another evaſion which is commonly made uſe of by the Romaniſt, in order to elude the force of this Canon; and becauſe this evaſion is moſt in vogue amongſt them therefore particularly I did conſider it.

Many of their controvertiſts, do pretend that the ancient Decree of *Gelaſius* was only temporary and occaſional, built upon the

the condition of the times; when it was made. *And therefore* (ſay they) *it might be abrogated without any violation of Divine law; when the reaſon of it, by the change of the times, was removed.* Now it is pretended, that the reaſon or cauſe of it was this; *In the age of* Gelaſius (ſay they) *the Church was exceedingly peſtered with a copious number of diſſembling* Manichees, *who had a mind to be accounted Catholicks; yet out of a ſuperſtitious averſion to Wine, abſtained from the Cup in the Sacrament.* And this, if we believe them, was the cauſe and reaſon of the Decree againſt receiving in one kind, and not any Divine Precept enjoyning both.

This I narrowly examined, and found it to be more idle and inſignificant than the former, which Cardinal *Baronius* called *ſenſeleſs and fooliſh.* For whatever the condition of thoſe times was, the principal reaſon of the Canon is inſerted into the Canon it ſelf, and it is this following, [*Becauſe a parting of one and the ſame myſtery cannot come to paſs without very great Sacriledge.*] Now I muſt beg leave of my old Friends, to tell them that this is no temporary or mutable reaſon: certainly, *not to commit Sacriledge* is a thing of unchangeable and perpetual obligation, neither has it any dependence upon the condition of any Age or Time: For let the Times change never ſo much, it will never be lawful to commit Sacriledge, and ſuch is communicating in one kind alone, if Pope *Gelaſius* may be believed.

Thus it is plain, that this ancient Decree is directly contrary to the late conſtitutions of the Roman Church, and theſe evaſions, invented in order to make it ſeem reconciliable, have not any plauſible colour of reaſon. Therefore I doubt not, but the judicious and impartial Reader will be ſatisfied, that it is neceſſary for all Chriſtians that come to the Lords Supper, to partake of it in both kinds; and that this neceſſity ariſes from the Command of our Saviour, enjoining all to drink of the Cup. The ancient Fathers did ſo believe, and teach, as the Authorities already cited do clearly and ſatisfactorily manifeſt. Herein I have *Lindanus* agreeing with me (though he was a great Defender of Popery) in theſe words, when he had firſt ſhewn what the Opinion of the old Writers was, ſaid,

'After this manner the ancient 'Fathers, chiefly St. *Leo*, *Gelaſi-* 'us, and the Fathers in the 'Council of *Tours* did deſire 'that that moſt ancient and al- 'together Apoſtolical Commu- 'nion in both kinds might be 'preſerved and obſerved by the 'Chriſtian people.

Hunc igitur in modum illam ve tuſtiſſimam, planéque Apoſtoli- cam utriuſque ſpeciei Communi- onem conſervatam atque obſerva- tam populo Chriſtiano cupiebant priſci Patres, Divus Leo, Ge- laſius, & Patres in Concilio Tu- ronenſi.

Laſtly. That the Reader may the better compare this ancient Doctrine and Practice with the novel and late Rule ſet up by the Romaniſts, it is neceſſary that I produce the Canon made by Pope *Martin* V. in the Council of *Conſtance* about 272 years ago, which forbids adminiſtring the Cup to the people. Becauſe the Canon is long I ſhall only produce two clauſes of it, and any man that pleaſes may conſult the whole, and judge whether I do any wrong. I am ſure, I intend to deliver nothing but what is truth. After a Preface containing the reaſons of their proceedings it is ſaid,

'The holy General Council of 'Conſtance defines, that altho' 'Chriſt did inſtitute this vene- 'rable Sacrament after Supper, 'and adminiſter it under both 'kinds, of Bread and Wine, to 'his Diſciples, (yet *hoc non ob- 'ſtante*) notwithſtanding this, it 'is firſt decreed, that the Sacra- 'ment ſhould not be celebrated 'after Supper.

Concilium ſacrum generale Con- ſtantienſe definit, quod licet Chri- ſtus poſt Cænam inſtituerit, & ſuis Diſcipulis adminiſtraverit ſub utraque Panis & Vini ſpe- cie, venerabile hoc Sacramen- tum (tamen hoc non obſtante) &c. Acta Conc. Conſtant. edit. Labb.

And then ſome things being brought in by way of Preamble, to put a blind upon the matter, 'It is alſo decreed, that the cuſtom 'of giving only one kind to the people (tho' contrary to Chriſts 'Inſtitution, and the Practice of the primitive Church) ſhould 'thenceforth be accounted Law. In the latter part of the Canon there is a clauſe directly oppoſite to the Decree of *Gelaſius* above

above mentioned. For whereas that ancient Pope had declared, that receiving in one kind could not be without Sacriledge, the Canon of *Constance* contradicts him after this manner;

'Therefore to say the observa-
'tion of this custom, or Law, is
'sacrilegious, ought to be judg-
'ed erroneous.

Quapropter dicere quod hanc consuetudinem, vel legem observare sit sacrilegum, censeri debet erroneum.

Then it seems the Decree of *Gelasius* ought to be judged erroneus. For that Decree affirms the custom or law about receiving in one kind to be sacrilegious, as has heretofore been abundantly shewn.

Thus having found the Practice and Doctrine of the present Church of *Rome* contrary and repugnant to the Word of God, and to the Judgment of ancient Authors, of which some were Popes, publickly enacting the direct opposite to what was lately decreed at *Constance*; I could not but conclude that I was in no right way: And therefore took up a resolution to adjoin my self to the Protestant Church, where I saw the Command of Christ carefully observed, and the Sacrament in both kinds given to the people, according to his Institution.

CHAP. V.

Of Image-Worship.

THe fifth Motive of my Conversion is the Use, or rather the Abuse of Images. There is none that pretends to the least knowledge of Antiquity, but knows that the Worship of Graven Images is far from being either a Christian, Apostolick, Primitive or Catholick Practice: and yet the Papists give to graven Images the Worship due to God, to Christ and his Saints, tho they pretend otherwise. We need not enquire what actions they suppose fit to be used in their Image-Worship: For these appear in their publick Processions, their Incensings, and Pilgrimages, their Prayers and Vows made unto them. Certainly the Worship of a graven

graven Image is plainly and frequently forbidden in the Old Teſtament, as you may read in the Commandments uttered with Gods own Mouth, with Thundring and Lightning on Mount *Sinai*, viz. *Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf any graven Image, nor the likeneſs of any thing, that is in Heaven above, or in the Earth beneath, or in the Water under the Earth; thou ſhalt not bow down to them, nor worſhip them.* Which Thunder from Heaven the Guides of the Romiſh Church diſcerning to threaten vehemently their dreadful Idolatry which daily they commit, thought fit in wiſdom to conceal the knowledge of the ſecond Commandment from the people, by excluding it from the Decalogue, and dividing the tenth into two. And notwithſtanding their Image-Worſhip is ſo infinite a Scandal to the Jews and Turks, and a Reproach to Chriſtianity it ſelf among all ſtrangers that live with them, and obſerve their Rites, and that it cannot in the leaſt be pretended to be lawful, but with the laborious artifices of many Airy and Metaphyſical Diſtinctions, which the people who moſt need them do leaſt underſtand; yet they uſe theſe and many other miſerable ſhifts, and ſilly evaſions, whereby they labour to darken the Light of the true Catholick Doctrine in this point, as has been manifeſted by many (of great capacity) to the full, in their Comments on *Deut.* 4. 15, 16. and other places of Scripture, where you may ſee that the adoring of the very true God himſelf in or by an Image cometh within the compaſs of Idolatry, which the Word of God condemneth: and therefore that this whole Doctrine and Practice is contrary to the Law of God I need not tell you. Let us hear what the primitive Chriſtians held concerning Images, firſt in their Councils, ſecondly in the Writings of the primitive Fathers.

Firſt then as to their Councils; For keeping of Pictures out of the Churches, the Canon of the *Eliberine* Council (held in *Spain* about the time of *Conſtantine the Great*) gives this direction; *It is our Will, that Pictures ought not to be in the Church, leſt that which is worſhiped or adored ſhould be painted on the Walls.* Which words have ſo troubled the Wits of the late Church of *Rome*, that *Melchior Canus* ſcrupleth not only to accuſe the Council

Council of Impudency, but alſo of Impiety for making ſuch a Law. In a Council of ſeveral Biſhops in the year of our Lord 730. under *Leo* the Emperor, titled *Iconomachus*, Images were ſolemnly condemned. And in another Council held at *Conſtantinople ann.* 755. or thereabouts, under the Reign of *Conſtantine Copronymus*, with great ſolemnity they were alſo condemned.

Notwithſtanding the ſeveral Decrees of theſe Councils enacted againſt the Idolatrous Worſhip of Images, the ſecond Council of *Nice* advanced Image-Worſhip. And that indeed was very likely to be the product of a Council aſſembled by that moſt wicked Empreſs *Irene*, who was bred and educated in Heatheniſm, and probably continued a Heathen in her heart all the days of her life, if we may judge of her Religion by her actions. Certainly no perſon, that had any ſenſe of Chriſtianity, would ever do the things that ſhe did. Now by the Authority and Intereſt of this impious Woman, and by the procurement of Pope *Adrian* I. this Decree for Image-worſhip was obtained.

But this Decree, altho' it was not by many degrees ſo groſs as what was afterwards invented by the Schoolmen of the Popiſh Communion, yet was rejected as repugnant to the Doctrine of the Church of God by the Princes and Biſhops of *England* about the year 792. and afterwards by *Charles the Great*, and the Biſhops of *Italy*, *France* and *Germany*, which by his appointment were gathered together in the Council of *Frankford* in the year 794.

Thus much I thought needful to be alledged againſt the Worſhip of Images from the Authority of Councils, ſome of which have better pretences to be accounted General, than either the ſecond of *Nice*, or that of *Trent* can pretend to.

But then in the ſecond place, if we conſider the Teſtimonies of the Fathers, we ſhall find them plain againſt Image-worſhip. The fact of *Epiphanius* rending the Veil that hung in the Church of *Anablatha* is effectual, to demonſtrate what an abomination it was in his days, and in his opinion, to worſhip Images; which himſelf in his Epiſtle to *John* Biſhop of *Hieruſalem* (tranſlated by St. *Hierom* out of Greek into Latin) does thus explain

'I found there (says he) a 'Veil hanging at the door of 'the Church dyed, and paint'ed, and having the Image as 'it were of Christ, or some 'Saint; for I do not well re'member whose Image it was. 'When therefore I saw this, 'that *contrary to the Athority of 'the Scriptures*, the image of a 'man was hanged up in the 'Church of Christ, I cut it, and 'gave counsel to the Keepers of 'the place, that they should 'wrap and bury some poor dead 'man in it.

Invenì ibi Velum pendere in foribus ejusdem Ecclesiæ tinctum, atque depictum, & habens Imaginem quasi Christi, vel Sancti cujusdam; non enim satis memini cujus Imago fuerit. Cum ergo hoc vidissem in Ecclesiâ Christi contra Auctoritatem Scripturarum hominis pendere Imaginem, scidi illud, & magis dedi consilium custodibus ejusdem loci ut pauperem mortuum ea involverent & efferrent. Epiph. Ep. ad Joan. Hierosolym. Tom. 2. Oper. Hieron. Ep. 60.

And afterwards he intreated the Bishop of *Jerusalem*, under whose Government this Church was,

'To give charge thereafter, 'that such Veils as these, which 'are repugnant to our Religion 'should not be hanged up in 'the Church of Christ.

Præcipere in Ecclesiâ Christi ejusmodi Vela, quæ contra nostram Religionem veniunt, non appendi. Epist. Epiphanii, ubi supra.

Had this holy Father now been arisen from the dead, and had seen the great number of Images not only hung in Churches, and Oratories of them of the Communion of *Rome*, but also worshiped and adored relatively (as their Disputants term it,) how much, Christian Reader, think you, would he be amazed and astonished hereat? would he not rather judge them to be the Churches of *Baal*, than of Christ? And yet these people brag of Antiquity after this, and pretend to rely on the Authority of ancient Writers in asserting the Lawfulness of Image-worship.

Let us hear in the next place what *Lactantius* says,

'Those consecrated Images '(says he) which vain men do 'serve, want all Sense, because

Imagines sacræ, quibus inanissimi homines serviunt, omni Sensu carent, quia terra sunt. Quis au-

'they

'they are earth. Now who is 'there, that understands not 'that it is unfit for an upright 'creature to be bowed down 'that he may worship the earth, 'which for this cause is put un-'der our feet that it may be 'trodden upon, not worshiped 'by us? Wherefore there is no 'doubt, but that there is no 'Religion wherever there is an 'Image —— There is nothing 'that is godly, but consists in 'heavenly things. Therefore I-'mages are things that have 'nothing to do with Religi-'on (or they are void of Reli-'gion) because nothing that is 'heavenly can be in that thing 'which is made of earth.

tem non intelligat nefas esse rectum animal curvari, ut adoret terram, quæ ideo subjecta est, ut calcanda à nobis non adoranda sit? Quare non esse dubium, quin Religio nulla sit ubicunque simulachrum est —— Divini autem nihil est nisi in cælestibus rebus; carent ergo Religione simulachra quia nihil potest esse cæleste in eâ re quæ sit ex terrâ. Lactant. lib. 2. cap. 17. & 18.

St. *Ambrose* affirms, that in his days the Church was an utter stranger to any thing like Images. He tells us,

'That the Church acknowledg-'ed no vain resemblances, nor 'any vain Figures of Images, 'but that it acknowledged the 'true Substance of the Trini-'ty.

Ecclesia inanes ideas, & vanas nescit simulachrorum figuras, sed veram novit Trinitatis substantiam. Lib. de Jacob. & Vitâ beata.

When *Adrian* the Emperor had commanded that the Temples should be in all Cities rendred clear of Images, it was immediately apprehended, that he had provided these Temples for Christ; as *Ælius Lampridius* noteth in the *Life of Alexander Severus*. Which is a convincing Argument, that it was not in use with Christians in those days, to have any Images in their Churches.

This, I suppose, is enough to demonstrate, that the ancient

and primitive Church was as great a Stranger to Images, and that it abhorr'd them as much as the Church of *England* does at preſent. Many and large Collections have been made by Proteſtant Writers of the Senſe and Opinions of antient Writers concerning this particular, unto whom I muſt refer the Reader, becauſe the preſent occaſion will not permit me to be prolix or tedious in reciting them. I have examined ſeveral of theſe Collections, and find them to be accurate, and this is one principal motive of my Converſion.

We ſee by what has been already alledged of what account the uſe of Images was in the ancient and beſt times: Chriſtians then would by no means permit them to be brought into their Churches. Nay, ſome of them would not ſo much as admit the Art it ſelf of making them; ſo jealous were they of the danger, and careful to prevent the deceit, whereby the ſimple might any way be drawn on to adore them.

Now the Church of *Rome* does own that it is very abominable to worſhip an Image abſolutely, that is, to make it the principal or ſole object of Adoration. But their evaſion herein is, that a relative Worſhip is not forbidden, nor falleth under the compaſs of Idolatry; that is to ſay, to worſhip an Image in regard of him whoſe Image it is, and by reaſon of the relation it has to him, it is not againſt the Commandment. To this I anſwer, that the Worſhip of it after that manner doth not excuſe the Worſhippers from Idolatry, ſince the Commandment is delivered in general expreſſions, and has no limitation or reſtriction; but it forbids, without exception, all bowing down to them, and worſhipping of them, of what kind ſoever the Worſhip be.

Had a relative Worſhip of Images been accounted lawful in the primitive ages, certainly the holy Fathers and Councils would not have omitted to acquaint us therewith. But we find the quite contrary: for when the Gentiles demanded of the ancient Chriſtians, why they had no known Images, they did not ſay, we have Images to be relatively worſhipped. But *Minutius Felix* returned them this for anſwer;

'What Image ſhall I make of God,

Quod enim ſimulachrum Deo fin-

'God, when Man himself, if 'you rightly judge, is Gods 'Image?

gam, cùm ipse Homo, si recte existimes, sit Dei simulachrum. Minut. in Octav.

St. *Augustine*, discoursing about the Duties that arise from the first Table of the Decalogue, has this following passage:

'It is forbidden that any similitude of God should be worshipped in things contrived by 'humane invention; not but 'that God has an Image, but 'because no Image of him 'ought to be worshipped, except that one (*meaning Christ*) 'which is the same thing with 'himself.

Prohibetur coli aliqua in figmentis hominem Dei similitudo, non quia non habet Imaginem Deus, sed quia nulla ejus Imago coli debet nisi illa, quæ hoc est quod ipse. Aug. Epist. 119. ad Januarium.

Here we see St. *Augustin*'s Opinion concerning the Sense of the second Commandment; he judges that worshiping any similitude of God by an invented Figure is herein prohibited, and consequently relative Worship, according to his Judgment, is a transgression of a divine Precept.

St. *Ambrose* agrees most exactly with him; He tells us, that 'God would not have himself 'worshiped in Stones.

Non vult se Deus coli in Lapidibus. Ambr. Ep. 31. ad Valentin.

That is, in Images made of Stone, and I suppose the case will be much the same if the Image be made of any other materials.

By these examples we see how far the ancient Writers of the Church differ'd in their Opinion concerning Image-worship from the present Church of *Rome*. The ancient Writers agree exactly with the Protestants, and were altogether of the same Perswasion with them, although the word or term of Protestant was not then known, but is of later times invented to signifie them that protest against the Errors of the Church of *Rome*.

I shall add a few words more concerning the original of this wicked practice. I find by St. *Irenæus, lib. 1. cap. 23. contra Heræs.* and also by others, that *Simon Magus* and his Disciples were the first that brought Images into the Christian Religion. If the

Romanists

Romanists will acknowledge these for their Patrons, themselves can tell how much it will redound to their Glory. It is true that this custom of Image-worship was very ancient, but very heretical also, and abominable. *Simon Magus* and his Sectaries were introducers thereof (as I said before,) who had Images, some painted in Colours, others fram'd of Gold, and of other matter, which they said, were Representations of Christ made under *Pontius Pilate*, when Christ was here conversant among men. Whence it came to pass, that *Carpocrates* and his disciple *Marcellina* (who brought this idolatrous practice to *Rome* in the time of Pope *Anicetus*) having privily made Images of *Jesus* and *Paul*, of *Homer* and *Pythagoras*, did crown and worship them, as *Irenæus* abovementioned does relate, *lib.* 1. *contra Hæres.* cap. 24. But against this wicked practice the ancient Christians did zealously and piously declare. Here is the eldest instance of Image-worship in any person that ever pretended to be any thing of a Christian; and we may see how severely it is censur'd, and mark'd with the infamous brand of Heresie; such then was the first rise of Images among Christians: but there was another cause, that much contributed to the advancement of their Worship, and that was this; Many simple Christians newly converted from Paganism could not unlearn the customs of it, as it is observed by *Eusebius* concerning the Image of Christ erected by the Woman that was cur'd of the Bloody Issue. *Euseb. Hist. Eccles.* c. 18. *It is no marvel* (says he) *that those of the Heathen, both of old were cured by our Saviour, should do such things, since we have seen the Images of the Apostles St. Paul and St. Peter, yea and of Christ himself kept painted with colours in Tables. For they* (that is, converted Gentiles) *of old were wont by a Heathenish custom thus to honour them whom they accounted to be their Benefactors or Preservers.*

But by whomsoever they were first brought in, certain it is they proved a pernicious allurement to the simple people, who soon went a whoring after them, contrary to the Command of God, and the Doctrine of the ancient Fathers and Defenders of Christianity.

This I find to be the true state of the whole affair concerning Image-

Image-worship, and I am heartily sorry that I understood it not heretofore. But I hope to obtain pardon, because I labour'd under great prejudices of my Education, and could not imagine that such grave and learned Doctors as have asserted the Lawfulness and Antiquity of Image-worship, would have led me into so gross an Error.

We are told by some of these Doctors, and particularly by the Archbishop of *Spalato*.

'That the veneration of Images 'even the most ancient, the 'whole and universal Church 'did embrace as a Doctrine of 'Faith; and that with unanimous consent and without any 'opposition or contradiction it 'did worship Statues, and 'Images.

Ecclesiam Christianam etiam antiquissimam, totam ac universalem summo consensu absque ullâ oppositione aut contradictione statuas ac imaginas veneratam esse. M. Anton. de Domin. de Consilio reditûs sect. 23.

Now for confutation of this shameless assertion, I appeal to the aforegoing Councils and Holy Fathers; certainly I had reason to grow dissatisfied with the Communion of *Rome*, when I saw that their great sticklers endeavoured to defend their Doctrines by such notorious and manifest untruth.

Concerning the Adoration of the Cross.

I Think the worship of the material Cross of Christ to be somewhat like the worship of Images, and that is the cause why I have rankt it under this general head, which I assign for my fifth Motive. But altho the Devotions paid by the Romanists to the Cross do in some respects resemble Image worship, yet in many regards they are much worse: For the Romanists do avowedly give *Latria* to the Cross, and although some of them do pretend that this is only given to it relatively; yet if one examine their Hymns and Prayers directed to the Wooden Cross, it will manifestly appear that their excuses are trivial, and their pretences vain. None doubts but that our Saviours Sufferings (which are often

often called the Croſs of Chriſt) do abundantly deſerve our greateſt regard, but then to transfer this to the material and literal Croſs is a wonderful thing, and I am aſtoniſht at my ſelf in that for ſo many years I never conſidered it, or weighed this matter, as I ought to have done. But I ſhall proceed to conſider ſome of the pretences, and excuſes which Roman Catholicks make in order to defend the worſhip of the Croſs.

Bellarmin ſayes *lib. 2. de Reliquiis Sanctis, that the Croſs ought to be adored by the ſame worſhip with Chriſt, becauſe it was touched by Chriſts Sacred Body.* But if this be true then it follows that the Bleſſed Virgin *Mary* is to be worſhiped by the ſame worſhip alſo, by reaſon ſhe carried him nine months in her Womb, ſhe nouriſht him &c. and his contact with her was natural, with the Croſs violent. But the Romaniſts deny ſuch due to her, therefore of neceſſity they ought to deny it to be due to the holy Croſs.

If *Latria* (or ſupreme Worſhip) be due to the Croſs for its contact with Chriſt, it ought rather for that reaſon to be attributed unto the Aſs, whereon Chriſt rid with ſolemnity to *Jeruſalem*; and to the ſeveral Beds, whereon He lay, and Ships, wherein he wafted from Region to Region; becauſe his attingency in and with them was voluntary, with the Croſs coactive. Nay they ought upon the ſame ground to adore *Judas* his lips, the Officers hands, that apprehended and bound Chriſt, the Scourges, whereby He was whipt, for they were inſtruments of his paſſion as well as the Croſs.

If they adore all other Croſſes for their reſemblance of the original Croſs ſo they ought to adore all Mangers, all Launces, all Nails, Thorns, Spittles, &c. for theſe have the ſame reſemblance to our Saviours Manger, and to thoſe Nails, Thorns &c. which were the inſtruments of his Paſſion.

They attribute more Honour unto Chriſts Croſs than to his Reſurrection by theſe words, 'We adore thy Croſs, and commemorate thy Reſurrection. *Crucem tuam adoramus, reſurrectionem tuam recolimus* They aſcribe then (it ſeems) Adoration to the Croſs which is only proper unto the Divine Nature, and to the Croſs likewiſe

likewiſe (that is to the Wood) they attribute the redemption of the world, and the reconcilation of mankind unto God the Father. *vide Bellarmin lib.* 2. *c.* 23. *ſect. Ac primum.* They alſo attribute forgiveneſs of Sins, and increaſe of Righteouſneſs to the Croſs, they repoſe their hopes and confidence in the dead Wood of the Croſs, and beg remiſſion of Sins from it; as may be ſeen in their Hymns extant in the *Roman Breviary*, corrected and reviſed by the authority of the Council of *Trent*, and ſet forth by ſeveral Popes, as may be ſeen in ſeveral Editions of it, eſpecially in that Printed at *Paris anno* 1662 whence I draw this that follows.

O Crux ave ſpes unica!
In hoc Paſchali gaudio
Auge piis Juſtitiam,
Reiſque dona veniam.

That is in Engliſh thus;

Hail O Croſs, our only hope!
In this our Paſchal joy,
Increaſe the Righteouſneſs of the pious,
And give pardon to the guilty.

Nothing, doubtleſs, can be more prodigious, unleſs it be what follows,

O Crux ſplendidior cunctis aſtris,
Mundo celebris, hominibus multum amabilis,
Sanctior univerſis,
Quæ ſola fuiſſe digna portare talentum mundi,
Dulce Lignum, dulces clavos dulcia ferens pondera,
Salva præſentem catervam
In tuis hodie laudibus congregatam.
Alleluja, Alleluja.

That is in Engliſh thus,

O Croſs! more bright than all the Stars,
Famous through the world, very lovely to mankind.
More holy than all other things,
Which waſt alone worthy to carry the Ranſom of the world,
Dear Wood, that carrieſt the dear Nails, and the dear Burden.

Save the preſent Aſſembly, which is to day gathered together for thy Praiſe.

Alleluja, Alleluja.

Great Complements, upon my word, for a liveleſs piece of Wood! for that they mean the material Croſs, (and not the Paſſion of our Saviour) their words do abundantly declare. We ſee here they repoſe their hope and confidence in the Wood; they beg increaſe of Grace from it, and aſcribe to it a Power to forgive Sins, which Attribute appertaineth to the Godhead only.

The Humanity of Chriſt, ſeparated from his Divinity, is not to be adored with divine Worſhip, as St. *Auguſtin* teacheth, *Homil.* 38. *de Verbis Domini.* Therefore much leſs his Croſs, or any other repreſentative Image of his.

The Holy Ghoſt is preſent in the Sacrament of Baptiſm; yet it is not to be adored with the ſame Worſhip due to the Holy Ghoſt. Therefore that Wood whereon Chriſt ſuffered, and other Blocks, or Stumps of Trees reſembling it, are not to be adored with the ſame veneration due unto Chriſt. Many conſequences that may be inferr'd from the Worſhip of the Croſs, and of Images, are ſo prodigiouſly abſurd, impious, blaſphemous, and ſo numerous, that if I endeavoured exactly to enumerate and proſecute them, I ſhould never come unto an end. Therefore I leave them to the upholders of theſe abuſes, whence they are emergent, and alſo theſe upholders to truſt to their Images, like to like, *for they that make them* (Pſal. 115. 8.) *are like unto them, and ſo is every one that truſteth in them.*

CHAP. VI.

Of Prayers in an unknown Tongue.

THe Sixth and laſt Motive or Cauſe of my Declenſion from the Church of *Rome*, is its lack of Charity, in robbing Chriſtians not only of the ſuperabundant effects of our Lords Supper, by

by diſmembring it, but alſo of that other effectual Remedy, which Chriſt left unto them, as means whereby they might attain unto Salvation, *viz.* the benefit of Publick Service, or Common Prayers, by hindring them to make uſe thereof in the vulgar tongue, intended by God and Nature for all peoples edification. This Common Service, Prayers, Liturgy, or Maſs, which in effect are all one, the Conventicle of *Trent* in the *22th Seſſ.* and *8th chap.* denies plainly to be expedient to uſe in the vulgar Tongue, or Idiom: So *Stapleton* the Jeſuit, in his Engliſh Book written againſt Biſhop *Jewel, Artic.* 3. *p.* 75. ſays inconſiderately, *that Devotion is rather hindred by uſing it in a known Idiom, than promoted. Bellarmine*, in the ſecond Book *de Verbo Dei, chap.* 15. endeavours to prove, that anciently Common Prayers were univerſally practiſed in the Latin tongue by all Nations, and conſequently now ought to be ſo.

This ſelf-ended and fabulous Narration of *Bellarmines* (I beg his leave for ſaying it) is far from truth, and as contrary to Chriſts Ordinance, to the Apoſtolick Practice, and the general Cuſtom of the primitive Church, as Fire and Water, black and white, cold and heat are one to another. Which firſt I prove by the Teſtimonies of Scripture. 2. By the undeniable Authorities of the holy Fathers. 3. By the uſual Practice of all other Chriſtian Nations. 4. I ſhall endeavour to prove that the Church of *Rome* hath borrowed this practice from ſuch Authors, as it is a ſhame for her to imitate.

The Teſtimonies of Scripture produced to this effect.

1. What Chriſt commanded, that ought religiouſly to be obſerved in his Church: but Chriſt by the mouth of his Apoſtle St. *Paul* commanded Common Prayers to be uſed in the vulgar Idiom underſtood by the hearers, 1 *Cor.* 14. 9. *So likewiſe you, except ye utter by the tongue words eaſy to be underſtood, how ſhall it be known what is ſpoken? for ye ſhall ſpeak unto the air.* v. 14. *For if I pray in an unknown tongue, my Spirit prayeth, but my underſtanding is unfruitfull.* v. 16. *Elſe, when thou ſhalt bleſs with the Spirit, how ſhall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned ſay Amen, at thy giving of thanks, ſeeing he underſtandeth not what thou ſayeſt?* And v. 19. *Yea*

I had rather ſpeak five words with my underſtanding in the Church, that by my voice I might teach others alſo, then ten thouſand words in an unknown tongue.

2. Whatever is done in the Church, that ought to redound to the edification thereof, 1 *Cor.* 14 *v.* 26. *How is it then, Brethren? when ye come together, every one of you hath a Pſalm, hath a Doctrine, hath a Tongue, hath Revelation, hath an Interpretation: let all things be done unto edifying.* But an unknown tongue edifies none. *Ibid. v.* 6. *Now, Brethren, if I come to you ſpeaking with tongues, what ſhall I profit you, except I ſhall ſpeak to you either by revelation, or knowledge, or by propheſying, or Doctrine?* *v.* 9. as above cited.

3. If the Miniſter prayeth in an unknown tongue, he is a Barbarian to the people, and alſo the people to him, 1 *Cor.* 14 *v.* 11. *Therefore if I know not the meaning of the voice, I ſhall be unto him, that ſpeaketh a Barbarian, and he that ſpeaketh a Barbarian unto me.*

4. All things ought to be done in the Church with decency, and due order, 1 *Cor.* 14. *v.* 40. *Let all things be done decently, and in order.* But the uſe of Prayers in an unknown tongue is directly againſt this Rule: becauſe when the Miniſter ſo prayeth, the hearers underſtand not what he ſays, nor conſequently pray, nor ſay *Amen* to any effect; nay, the Miniſter only, who underſtandeth the Divine Service, prayeth; and ſo the Prayers, which ought to be publick, by this means are become private, which is as oppoſite to the Decency, and right Order of the Church, as Whoremongering to the ſeventh Commandment.

5. As the Prophets, Chriſt, the Apoſtles, and their true Succeſſors have ſolemnly miniſtred the Rites and publick Office of the Church, even ſo now and perpetually they ought (as far as is poſſible) in the ſame form, manner and method, without alteration, to be miniſtred. But they miniſtred them in the vulgar Language, according to the capacity of their Hearers, as St. *Paul* abundantly witneſſeth in the aforegoing 1 *Cor.* 14. And beſides many of the Papiſts themſelves own, that Prayers underſtood are far better, and more available; as *Lyranus* on the firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians* 14. and Cardinal *Cajetan* in *Comment.* on the ſame chap.

chap. Therefore the practice of praying in a known tongue being better, and more effectual for edifying the people, ought still to be retained in the Church; whereas she is always to edifie, and not destroy.

Though the whole ſtream of all the holy Fathers cannot more convincingly prove the certainty of this truth, than St. *Paul* hath done already; yet for the further ſatisfaction of the Reader, I will produce a few Teſtimonies to the ſame purpoſe, ſo pregnant as not to be avoided. *Baſil the Great in Epiſt.* 63. has theſe following words; 'By the dawning of the day (*ſays he*) the Congregation of the Faithful altogether with one voice, and one mind, offereth a Pſalm of Thankſgiving unto the Lord, and every one in his own proper ſpeech acknowledgeth his amendment of life — Which practices are conſented unto in all the Churches of God.'

Illucescente jam die pariter una ore, ac corde omnes fideles, Confeſſionis Pſalmum Deo offerunt, ac ſuis quisque verbis reſipiscentiam profitetur — Quæ conſuetudines omnibus Dei Eccleſiis conſentientes ſunt.

How could this cuſtom of uſing Common Prayers with one voice, or language, in *Baſil the Great*'s time, in all Chriſtian Churches, be plauſible amongſt the faithful, if their Liturgies (as *Bellarmine* feigns) had been cuſtomarily uſed in Latin? For it cannot be properly ſaid, that they offered *unâ voce* Thankſgiving unto the Lord, if they practiſed diverſity of Languages.

Saint *Auguſtine* affirms the ſame, *l. 2. in Gen. c. 8.* in theſe words. 'None can be edified by hearing that which he underſtands not.'

Nemo (inquit) ædificatur audiendo quod non intelligit.

And on *Pſalm* 99. he ſays again. 'Bleſſed be they, who underſtand the magnificent Praiſe of the Lord: let us haſten to this Bleſſedneſs: let us underſtand it: let us not pour it out, unleſs we underſtand it.'

Beatus populus, qui intelligit jubilationem: curramus ad hanc Beatitudinem: intelligamus jubilationem: non eam ſine intellectu fundamus.

Hence follows, that few in the Church of *Rome* can attain unto this bleſſedneſs of underſtanding the Lords Praiſe; becauſe it cannot

cannot be compaſſed without perfect knowledge of the Latine tongue, which cannot be acquired without a tedious progreſs in the ſtudy of it; which progreſs is morally impoſſible for the Commonalty, who make up the greateſt number in that Communion: Yet they are uncharitably, and that contrary to S. *Auguſtines* Admonition, excluded from this Bleſſedneſs, by a new Commandment and Article of Faith, lately fabricated in the Conventicle of *Trent*, to their utter deſtruction. For what profit can they receive that hear a ſound, and are ſtrangers to the meaning of it? it were as good that they were abſent as preſent: and therefore *Solomon* calls this doting kind of ſerving God *Sacrificium ſtultorum*, a Sacrifice of Fools; and ſo really it is: For they that hear it are no further benefited thereby, than they have capacity to apprehend it; as *Azorius* learnedly affirms in theſe words, 'Devotion ſprings from underſtanding; when there is 'no underſtanding of things 'that are ſought, or ſaid, there 'is but little Devotion, and 'conſequently very little bene-'fit reapt by the hearer. *Affectus conſequitur intellectum; ubi autem earum rerum, quæ petuntur, aut dicuntur, nullus habetur intellectus, ibi exiguus aſſurgit affectus, & conſequenter valde exiguus fructus.*

Indeed according to this grave Doctors opinion, it were as advantagious to them that are not Latiniſts, to have a ſpeechleſs Prieſt ſo ſay Maſs mentally, as one that hath the freedom of ſpeaking to ſay it loudly; for he that cannot ſpeak and hath no ſpeech, and he that hath none to be underſtood is all alike unto the ignorant, in regard of profiting them; which is a thing rarely well confirmed by St. *Auguſtine*, in the 4*th Book* of his *Chriſtian Doctrine*, the 10*th chap.* exciting the people with a great deal of vehemency to refrain from the perverſe cuſtom of praying in an unknown Language, which in no way (ſays he, tends to edification. 'There is no cauſe (ſays he) why a man ſhould ſpeak 'at all, if they for whoſe ſake he ſpeaks underſtand him not. *Quid prodeſt locutionum integritas, quam non ſequitur intellectus audientis? Cum loquendi nulla cauſa, ſi quod loquimur non intelligunt, propter quos ut intelligant loquimur.*

For

For God hears the Prieſts thoughts when he ſpeaks not, as well as when he ſpeaks; he hears the Prayers of the Heart, and ſees the Word of the Mind, and a ſpeechleſs Prieſt can do all the Ceremonies, and make the Signs, and he that ſpeaks aloud to them that underſtand him not does no more.

So the Author of the *Expoſition upon the firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians*, by ſome thought to be St. *Ambroſe*, *chap.* 14. ſays,

'If ye be convened to edifie the 'Church, things ought to be 'ſpoken, which the hearers un- 'derſtand.

Si ad Eccleſiam ædificandam convenitis, ea dici debent, quæ intelligunt auditores.

Which Doctrine is plainly ſeconded by *Caſſiodore* upon *Pſal.* 46. in theſe words,

'We ought not only (ſays he) 'to ſing, but alſo to know and 'underſtand the ſenſe & mean- 'ing of our ſinging; for none 'can do any thing rationally, 'except he knoweth the mean- 'ing of it.

Non ſolum (inquit) cantantes, ſed intelligentes pſallere debemus; nemo enim quidquam facit ſapienter quod non intelligit.

And likewiſe by *Jacobus Faber Stapul.* in his *Comment. on* 1 *Cor.* 14. who affirms (rebuking the people for their Lewdneſs touch this particular,)

'That a great part of the world, 'now a days prayeth, but 'whether their Prayers pro- 'ceed from the Spirit of God I 'know not, but I know they 'pray not from the heart, nor 'to any effect: becauſe they 'pray in an unknown tongue.

Maxima pars hominum cum nunc orat, neſcio ſi Spiritu ſcio tamen quod non mente orat: nam linguâ orat quam non intelligit.

If the aforegoing incontroulable Authorities of theſe holy Fathers be not ſufficient to confute *Bellarmines* groundleſs Sutmiſe, and imaginary Comment, by ſaying, *that in the former ages of the primitive Church Common Prayers were generally praſtiſed in Latin*

Latin amongſt the Faithful, and Profeſſors of Chriſtianity; for his and his Sticklers Diſgrace and Shame, I add *Thomas Aquinas* on 1 *Cor.* 14. *Lyra ibid.* and *Caſſander Liturg. cap.* 28. who, ſiding with St. *Paul*, do frequently tell us, that Divine Service or publick Prayers in an unknown Tongue do not edifie, and conſequently were forbidden; as I have ſhewn evidently already? To this effect I might produce the torrent of the holy Fathers, who flouriſhed in the ſucceeding ages of the Church, but that I am willing to ſhun prolixity. And ſo I go on to the proof of the third part of my Aſſertion, which is, That the Practical Cuſtom of all Chriſtian Nations anciently was, to pray in their own native Languages, and it is to this very day.

Here *Origen* in his 8*th Book againſt Celſus* may come in as an impartial Witneſs, teſtifying, that the *Grecians* in their Prayers uſe *Greek*, and the *Romans* the *Roman* Language, and ſo every Nation according to his Idiom prayeth to God, and praiſeth him as they were able.

And *Lyra* ſeconds him thus, on 1 *Cor. c.* 14. affirming, that in the primitive Church Bleſſings, our Lords Prayer, and all other things were done in the vulgar tongue: nay, not only Common Prayers, but the whole Bible was anciently by many Tranſlations made fit for the peoples uſe; as St. *Hierom Epiſt. ad Sophr.* affirms, that himſelf tranſlated the Bible into the *Dalmatian* tongue. And *Ulphilas Sozom lib.* 6. *Hiſt. c.* 37. a Biſhop among the *Goths* tranſlated it into the *Gothick* tongue. And that it was tranſlated into all other Languages, we are told by St. *Chryſoſt. Homil.* 1. *in* S. *Joannis.* By S. *Auguſt. l.* 2. *c.* 5. *de Doctrina Chriſtiana.* And *Theodoret Serm.* 5. *de Græcar. Affect. Curat.*

Beſides all theſe authentick Teſtimonies of the aforementioned renowned Doctors, who indifferently acquaint all Chriſtians, that in the primitive Church the Prieſt and the People joined together in their Prayers, and underſtood each other, and prayed in their mother-tongue; I will produce for a further and more palpable conviction of this Foppery, the words of the Civil and Canon Law. *Juſtinian* the Emperour made a Law in theſe words; *Our Will*

and

and Command it, that all the Biſhops and Prieſts do celebrate the Sacrament of Oblation, and the Prayers thereunto added in the holy Baptiſm with a loud and clear voice, which may be underſtood by the faithful, that thereby the minds of the Hearers may be raiſed up with greater Devotion, to ſet forth the Praiſe of the Lord God; for ſo the Apoſtle teacheth, 1 Cor. 14.

And *Innocent* III. is moſt expreſs herein, in the great General Council of *Lateran*, (as themſelves eſteem,) held *anno* 1215. *Can.* 9. where he hath theſe words; *Becauſe* (ſaith he) *in many places within the ſame City and Dioceſs the people of divers Tongues are mixt together, having under one and the ſame Faith divers Ceremonies and Rites, We ſtrictly charge and command, that the Biſhops of ſuch Cities and Dioceſſes provide men fit, who may celebrate the Divine Office according to the diverſity of their Languages, &c.*

If you will inquire, why are they not as ſtedfaſt followers of Pope *Innocent* in this point, as in that of Tranſubſtantiation? I can give you no other reaſon, but that (I am afraid) they will be called Libertines by their ill-wiſhers, for making uſe of the Laws of God and Man (as they pleaſe) to the advancement of their Self-ended Errors; and for impudently rejecting what is contrary thereunto. Now if the uſual Cuſtom of the Prophets, Chriſts Inſtitution, and exemplary manner of preaching and teaching to ſay Prayers in an underſtood Language; if the Words of the Apoſtle, the Practice of the primitive Church, the Sayings of the holy Fathers, and Confeſſions of impartial men of their own Communion, if the Conſent of all other Chriſtian Nations, and the Piety of our Forefathers, if right Reaſon and the nature of publick Service it ſelf, if the Needs of the Ignorant, and Condition of the holy Prayers, if the Laws of Princes, and the Laws of the Church, which require all our Prayers to be ſaid according to the Underſtanding of our Auditors; if all theſe cannot prevail with the Church of *Rome*, to do ſo much good to the poor ignorant peoples Souls, as to conſent they ſhould underſtand what in particular they ask of God; aſſuredly, there is great pertinacy of Opinion, and very little Charity to thoſe precious Souls for whom Chriſt ſuffer'd, and for whom they muſt give a ſtrict account.

And the Papiſts themſelves own, that at this very inſtant of time the *Egyptians*, *Moſcovians*, *Sclavonians*, *Armenians*, *Ethiopians*, *Moravians*, *Bohemians*, *Hungarians*, the *Jacobites*, *Abaſſines*, and all other Chriſtian Nations have, in and throughout the whole Univerſe, their Liturgies in their own native Languages. And *Eckius* affirms, that the ſame practice, and no other, is obſerved in the *Indies* in *Aſia*, in *Africa*, or any other part of the world amongſt Chriſtians. And that being ſo, it is ſtrange that the Proteſtants ſhould not have the ſame priviledge, without any peremptory Cenſure from the See of *Rome* of being Hereticks, and damned, for doing nothing elſe but what other Chriſtians do.

As to the proof of the fourth part of this Aſſertion; This prophane cuſtom of Prayers in an unknown Language, which the Church of *Rome* ſo cloſely ſticks unto, is derived,

1. From the *Oſſeni* Hereticks, as *Epiphanius* affirms, *Hæreſ.* 19.

2. From the *Heracleonites*, of whom St. *Auguſtine* gives an account; ſaying, *That they taught to pray with obſcure words, ſuppoſing that words in a barbarous and unknown tongue might be more powerful.*

3. (If we may give credit to famous Hiſtorians, both ancient and modern,) From the *Jews*, who in their Synagogues, not only formerly, but at this very day, read *Hebrew*, which the people rarely underſtand. And beſides, from the *Turks*, who in their Moſques read *Arabick*, of which the people know nothing.

The very conſideration of theſe leading Patterns, which the Church of *Rome* does ſo pertinatiouſly imitate herein, have been ſo prevailing with me, as to forſake her Communion, and to embrace that of the Reformed Church, wherein ſurer Guides unto Eternity can be demonſtrated.

And now having given an account of the Motives of my Change, I have one only Requeſt to make to the candid Proteſtants; that they would not treat a new Convert as the Chriſtians did St. *Paul* on his firſt Change, *Act.* 9. 26. by being afraid of me, and not believing me to be a ſincere Proſelyte: for

as

as I never perſecuted any of them in my life, but rather did them all good offices that lay in my power: ſo I hope it will be ſome motive to them to believe my Converſion real, when it is done at a time when they themſelves are not without fears and apprehenſions of Diſadvantage.

FINIS.

ADVERTISEMENT.

BEcauſe that I (the Writer of the foregoing Book) am in ſome degree a ſtranger to the Engliſh Tongue, I deſire the Reader ingeniouſly to pardon my unskilfulneſs in it, and not to be diſguſted if he meet with ſome improprieties in the Language; for although by the advice and direction of my Friends many improper expreſſions were corrected; yet I ſuppoſe that ſome Errors of that nature do ſtill remain.

ERRATA.

PAge 3. line 22. read *Armenians*, p. 4. in the margin r. *Salmeron. lib. 3. Orthodoxarum Explicationum Reſp. ad Axiom. 6. & alii apud Cajetanum lib. 1. c. 12. prim. part. de quadripart. juſtit.* p. 6. l. 20. r. *taken*, p. 7. l. 25. and afterwards r. *Caiaphas*, ib. l. 30. r. *de Conciliorum Authoritate*, p. 8. l. 4. r. *Nation*, ib. in the Latin citation r. *Eccleſia*, p. 15. l. 18. r. *Faith and Duties*, ib. l. 28. r. *unus parts in ten*, p. 16. l. 33. r. *Romiſh Religion*, p. 17. l. 1. r. *to the rights*, ib. l. 2. r. *liberties*, p. 30. l. 5. r. *yet it ceaſes not*, ib. l. 18 r. *for itu*, p. 31. l. 28. r. *he does*, p. 33 in the latin citation of *Lindanus*, r. *id eſt anno Domini*, p. 35. in the latin citation of Card. *Bona* r. *ſub ſpecie*, ib. r. *communicarunt*, p. 41. l. 8. r. *neceſſity*, p. 42. l. 13. of the latin citation r. *ſacrilega*, p. 43. l. 31. r. *impartial*, ib. l. ult. r. *corporis*, p. 44. l. 11. r. *parting of one*, p. 45. l. 25. r. *reconcilable*, ib. l. 32. r. *Lindanus, who agreeing*, p. 47. l. 7. r. *erroneous*, p. 51. l. 14. r. *therefore*, p. 54. l. 13. r. *Hæreſ.* p. 57. l. 3. r. *Bell. lib. 2. c. 23. de Reliquiis ſanctis.*

Books Printed for and Sold by William Norman *and* Eliphal Dobſon.

BIbles and Common Prayers in all volumes.
Book of Homilies.
Boltons Statutes.
Boltons Juſtice of Peace.
Book of Rates.
Plurality of Worlds.
Prayers and Meditations.
Gawens Logicks.
Mortons Devotions.
Dr. Lakes Officium Euchariſticum.
Dr. Burnets Life of the Earl of Rocheſter.
Tillotſon againſt Tranſubſtantiation.
Biſhop of Corks Sermons.
Silvius de Febribus.
Mullineux's Sciothericum Teleſcopicum.
Diſcourſe againſt Purgatory.
Diſcourſe againſt Auricular Confeſſion.
The Intereſt of *Ireland*.